

A. REPORT TO THE HEARING EXAMINER

HEARING DATE: April 19, 2016

Project Name: Quendall Terminals

Owner: Altino Properties, Inc. and J. H. Baxter & Co., 800 S. Third Street, Renton WA, 98057

Applicant/Contact: Campbell Mathewson, Century Pacific, L. P., 1201 Third Ave, suite 1680, Seattle, WA 98101

File Number: LUA09-151, ECF, EIS, SA-M, SM

Project Manager: Vanessa Dolbee, Current Planning Manager

Project Summary: The applicant is requesting Master Plan Review, Binding Site Plan, Shoreline Substantial Development Permit and Environmental (SEPA) Review for a mixed-use development. The site is 21.46 acres and is zoned Commercial/Office/Residential (COR) and located within the Urban Shoreline designation. The 21.24-acre site would be divided into 7 lots of which 4 would contain multi-story mixed-use buildings. Overall, the development would consist of 692 residential units (resulting in a net residential density of 40.95 units/acre), 20,025 square feet of retail and 9,000 square feet of restaurant. The applicant has proposed to dedicate 3.70 acres for public right-of-way and 0.65 acres of private streets, which would provide access to the 7 proposed lots. Surface and structured parking would be provided for 1,366 vehicles. The site contains sensitive slopes, seismic hazards, wetlands and 1,583 linear feet of shoreline along Lake Washington. The subject site has received a Superfund designation from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the property owners are currently working on a remediation plan with EPA. Proposed improvements include remediation of existing contamination and associated wetland and shoreline restoration as approved by the EPA. The subject land use applications are assuming a clean site following an approved and implemented Record of Decision from the EPA.

Project Location: SW ¼ Section 29, Township 24 N, Range 5 E. Parcel 2924059002. South of the Seahawks VMAC Training Facility

Site Area: 21.24 acres (upland)



Project Location Map

B. EXHIBITS:

- Exhibit 1: Staff report to the Hearing Examiner
- Exhibit 2: Environmental Review Documents – Draft EIS, Addendum to the Draft EIS, FEIS and Mitigation Document: <http://rentonwa.gov/business/default.aspx?id=32800>
- Exhibit 3: Environmental Review Committee Signature Sheets
- Exhibit 4: Neighborhood Detail Map
- Exhibit 5: Binding Site Plan
- Exhibit 6: Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order Dismissing Appeal and e-mail chains following request.
- Exhibit 7: Site Plan (black and white and color)
- Exhibit 8: Parking Plan (black and white and color)
- Exhibit 9: Area Outline of Spaces
- Exhibit 10: Elevations
- Exhibit 11: Conceptual Landscape Plan
- Exhibit 12: Conceptual Storm Drainage and Grading Plan
- Exhibit 13: Roadway Sections
- Exhibit 14: Conceptual Utility Plan
- Exhibit 15: EA Letter addressing EPA and public involvement in the process
- Exhibit 16: Advisory Notes/Plan Review Comments
- Exhibit 17: Concurrence Memo
- Exhibit 18: Additional Lanes Required

C. GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. **Owner(s) of Record:** Altino Properties, Inc. and J. H. Baxter & Co.
800 S. Third Street
Renton WA, 98057
2. **Zoning Classification:** Commercial/Office/Residential (COR)
3. **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation:** Commercial/Office/Residential (COR)
4. **Existing Site Use:** Vacant - Superfund Site
5. **Critical Areas:** Sensitive slopes, seismic hazards, wetlands, and Lake Washington
6. **Neighborhood Characteristics (2016):**
- a. **North:** *Seahawks Training Facility, COR*
 - b. **East:** *King County East Side Rail Corridor, Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) ROW, I-405, undeveloped COR zoned property*
 - c. **South:** *Barbee Mill Development, R-10 zone (in 2009 zoned COR)*
 - d. **West:** *Lake Washington*
6. **Site Area:** 21.24 acres (upland)

D. HISTORICAL/BACKGROUND:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Land Use File No.</u>	<u>Ordinance No.</u>	<u>Date</u>
Comprehensive Plan (vested)	N/A	5099	11/01/2004
Zoning (vested)	N/A	5099	11/01/2004
Annexation	N/A	1791	09/09/1995

E. PUBLIC SERVICES:

1. **Existing Utilities**
- a. Water: Water service will be provided by the City of Renton. There is an existing 12 inch diameter water main on the King County parcel fronting the site and an 10 inch water main extending into the Quendall Terminals site.
 - b. Sewer: Sewer service is provided by the City of Renton. There is a 12 inch sewer main extending near the east property line of the Quendall Terminals parcel. The Baxter Lift Station is also located in the north east corner of the site, within an existing Sanitary Sewer Easement, Rec. No. 2008090200178.
 - c. Surface/Storm Water: There is an existing 12 inch diameter stormwater line on N 42nd Place that ends near the west property line of the Quendall Terminals parcel.
2. **Streets**: New streets would be required to be developed to serve the proposed development. Access to these roads would be from N 42nd Place and Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way).
3. **Fire Protection**: City of Renton Fire Department

F. APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE RENTON MUNICIPAL CODE (VESTED FEB. 5, 2010):**1. Chapter 2 Land Use Districts**

- a. Section 4-2-020: Purpose and Intent of Zoning Districts
- b. Section 4-2-070: Zoning Use Table
- c. Section 4-2-120: Commercial Development Standards

2. Chapter 3 Environmental Regulations

- a. Section 4-3-050: Critical Area Regulations
- b. Section 4-3-090: Shoreline Master Program Regulations

3. Chapter 4 Property Development Standards**4. Chapter 6 Streets and Utility Standards**

- a. Section 4-6-060: Street Standards

5. Chapter 7 Subdivision Regulations

- a. Section 4-7-230: Binding Site Plans

6. Chapter 9 Permits- Specific

- a. Section 4-9-190: Shoreline Permits
- b. Section 4-9-200: Site Development Plan Review

7. Chapter 11 Definitions**G. APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (VESTED):**

- 1. Community Design Element
- 2. Economic Development Element
- 3. Housing Element
- 4. Land Use Element
- 5. Parks, Recreation, and Open Space and Trails Element

H. FINDINGS OF FACT (FOF):

- 1. The Planning Division of the City of Renton accepted the above master application for review on November 18, 2009 and determined the application complete on February 10, 2010. The project was subject to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) therefore, per RMC 4-8-050B.6., the project is exempt from the 120 day review process.
- 2. The November 2009 application did not include a request for a Binding Site Plan. The Binding Site Plan request was included in the February 2010 resubmittal. Binding Site Plan applications allow for vesting pursuant to the Washington State Vested Rights Doctrine. Therefore the subject project vested to the regulations in place in 2010 when the Binding Site Plan application was submitted and the project was determined complete. The project has vested up to ORD 5520. All code sections referenced in this staff report are reflective of the vesting date, February 10, 2010.

3. The project site is located along the shoreline of Lake Washington, north of the Barbee Mill Development and south of the Seahawks (VMAC) Training Facility, parcel number 2924059002. Access is from I-405 Exit 7.
4. The site includes 20.04 acres on the Main Property, which fronts along Lake Washington, and approximately 1.20 acres on the Isolated Property located across Seahawk's Way to the northeast.
5. The Preferred Alternative re-submitted to the City on January 13, 2016 consists of 692 residential units (resulting in a net residential density of 40.95 units/acre), 20,025 square feet of retail and 9,000 square feet of restaurant spread across four Lots (2 – 5). All buildings are designed to be constructed as 3 – 5 stories over one parking/commercial level. The table below provides a breakdown of what is proposed on each lot (see site plan, Exhibit 7, for more details):

Lot	Proposal
Lot 1	100 foot shoreline buffer area abutting Lot 2.
Lot 2 (NW)	First Floor: 5,425 SF Retail, 4,500 SF Restaurant, 95 car parking garage, and 38 stall surface parking lot. On top of the first floor platform two residential towers are proposed (NW 1 and NW 2). NW 1 is 5 floors with 71 units. NW 2 is 4 floors with 56 units.
Lot 3 (NE)	First Floor: 4,700 SF Retail and 206 car parking garage. On top of the first floor platform two residential towers are proposed (NE 1 and NE 2). NE 1 is 5 floors with 82 units. NE 2 is 4 floors with 72 units.
Lot 4 (SE)	First Floor: 4,700 SF Retail, 318 car parking garage, and 42 stall surface parking lot. On top of the first floor platform two residential towers are proposed (SE 1 and SE 2) and a 130 car parking deck. SE 1 is 5 floors with 82 units. SE 2 is 4 floors with 72 units.
Lot 5 (SW)	First Floor: 5,400 SF of Retail, 4,500 SF Restaurant, 347 car parking garage, and 151 stall surface parking lot. On top of the first floor platform four residential towers are proposed (SW 1, SW 2, SW 3, and SW 4). SW 1 is 5 floors with 71 units. SW 2 is 5 floors with 80 units. SW 3 is 4 floors with 64 units. SW 4 is 3 floors with 42 units.
Lot 6	100 foot shoreline buffer area abutting Lot 5.
Lot 7	Isolated Parcel. Identified as the Middle Parcel on the binding site plan.

6. The project site is the location of a former creosote manufacturing facility that operated from 1917 to 1969. In the past coal tars and creosote have contaminated soil, groundwater, surface water and lake sediments. Based on this history in 2005 the Department of Ecology transferred the oversight of the Quendall Terminals environmental clean up to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
7. The site received a Superfund designation from the EPA. The EPA is conducting a remedial investigation and feasibility study to better understand the type and amount of contamination and develop a cleanup plan. This work is being conducted under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA; i.e. Superfund).
8. The EPA's CERCLA process is a separate process then the City's land use review. The project manager at the EPA for the site is Clair Hong, hong.clair@epa.gov.

9. Currently the site is vacant. However, the City worked with the EPA (Exhibit 15) to define the baseline assumptions that would result from the CERCLA cleanup action specified in the final cleanup remedy. These same baseline assumptions are being used to evaluate the Binding Site Plan, Master Site Plan and Shoreline Permit (see Exhibit 2, DEIS Chapter 2, for more details on the baseline assumptions).
10. In short the CERCLA remedy is assumed to include remediation of hazardous substances in lake sediments and in some of the upland portions of the site (Main Property), including placement of a soil cap across the entire Main Property and shoreline restoration in a 100 foot shoreline buffer. Potential impacts associated with cleanup/remediation activities will be addressed through the separate EPA process and the subject land use permits assume a site after remediation has been accomplished.
11. Access to the site would be provided via to primary access points. The first would be an extension of N 42nd Place to Street A. The second would be a new crossing over the existing rail bed from Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) to Street E. The overall development would gain access by the construction of three new east west roadways and two new north south road ways, identified as Road A – E. The applicant has proposed to dedicate Road A, B, and C and Roads D and E would be private driveways.
12. The property is located within the Commercial Office Residential (COR) Comprehensive Plan land use designation and zoning classification.
13. The site is located within Design District C.
14. The site is mapped with sensitive slopes, seismic hazards, and wetlands on the City Critical Areas Map. Due to the baseline assumptions described above under FOF 6-10 it is assumed the only remaining critical area would be seismic hazards following cleanup and wetland and shoreline restoration would be located in the 100 foot shoreline setback.
15. The site is located within Shoreline Jurisdiction, Urban Shoreline designation.
16. It is anticipated that approximately 53,000 – 133,000 cubic yards of fill would be imported to the site.
17. The applicant is proposing to begin construction after the EPA has issued a Record of Decision (ROD) identifying a remedy for clean up. The anticipated date of this decision is unknown at this time.
18. A total of 75 comment letters from both the public and agencies were received during the comment period on the DEIS, and 8 people commented at the DEIS public hearing held on January 4, 2011. A total of 12 letters were received during the comment period on the EIS Addendum. Please see Exhibit 2, FEIS, Chapter 3 for comment letters and responses.
19. Pursuant to the City of Renton's Environmental Ordinance and SEPA (RCW 43.21C, 1971 as amended), on February 19, 2010 the Environmental Review Committee issued a Determination of Significance (DS) for the Quendall Terminals Project, which initiated the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Process. The following table provides a time line related to the EIS process for the project:

Date	EIS Action, see Exhibits 2, 3, and 15.
2/19/10 – 4/30/10	EIS Public Scoping Period, 70 days (extended)
4/27/10	Public Scoping Meeting
12/10/2010	DEIS Issuance
12/10/10 – 2/09/11	DEIS Public Comment Period, 60 days (extended)
1/04/11	DEIS Public Hearing

10/19/12	EIS Addendum Issuance
10/19/12 – 11/19/12	EIS Addendum Public Comment Period
8/31/15	FEIS Issuance
8/31/15 – 9/24/15	EIS Public Appeal Period
9/24/15	Appeal submitted to EIS, Appellant South End Gives Back
2/18/16	Receipt of Joint Stipulation & Proposed Order Dismissing Appeal signed by the Appellant and Applicant
2/22/16	Joint Stipulation & Proposed Order Dismissing Appeal signed by the Hearing Examiner. Appeal Dismissed.

20. Based on an analysis of probable impacts from the proposal, the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) issued a Mitigation Document on August 31, 2016 which includes 91 mitigation measures for the project, Exhibit 2, Mitigation Document. The mitigation measures address impacts to Earth, Critical Areas, Environmental Heath, Energy – Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land and Shoreline Use, Aesthetics/Views, Parks and Recreation, Transportation, Cultural Resources, and Construction Impacts.
21. Representatives from various city departments have reviewed the application materials to identify and address issues raised by the proposed development. These comments are contained in the official file, and the essence of the comments has been incorporated into the appropriate sections of this report and the Departmental Recommendation at the end of this report, also see Exhibit 16.
22. **Comprehensive Plan Compliance:** The site is designated Commercial/Office/Residential (COR) on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map. The purpose of the COR designation is to provide opportunities for large-scale office, commercial, retail, and multifamily projects developed through a master plan and site plan process incorporating significant site amenities and/or gateway features. COR sites are typically transitions from an industrial use to a more intensive land use. The sites offer redevelopment opportunities on Lake Washington and/or the Cedar River. The proposal is compliant with the COR land use designation and the Community Design Element, Economic Development Element, Environmental Element, Housing Element, Land Use Element, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space and Trails Element if all conditions of approval are met. See analysis, Exhibit 2, DEIS Page 3.6-1 – 3.6-13.
23. **Zoning Development Standard Compliance:** The site is classified Commercial/Office/Residential (COR) on the City's Zoning Map. Development in the COR Zone intended to provide for a mix of intensive office, hotel, convention center, and residential activity in a high-quality, master-planned development that is integrated with the natural environment. Commercial retail and service uses that are architecturally and functionally integrated are permitted. Also, commercial uses that provide high economic value may be allowed if designed with the scale and intensity envisioned for the COR Zone. The scale and location of these sites will typically denote a gateway into the City and should be designed accordingly. The proposal is compliant with the following development standards if all conditions of approval are met:

Compliance	COR Zone Develop Standards and Analysis
Compliant if condition of approval are met	<p>Density: The allowed density range in the COR zone is a minimum of 30 to a maximum of 50 dwelling units per net acre. Net density is calculated after the deduction of sensitive areas, areas intended for public right-of-way, and private access easements.</p> <p>In the COR zone, the same area used for commercial and office development can also</p>

	<p>be used to calculate residential density. Where commercial and/or office areas are utilized in the calculation of density, the City may require restrictive covenants to ensure the maximum density is not exceeded should the property be subdivided or in another manner made available for separate lease or conveyance.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Based on the provided site plan 4.35 acres would be located in rights-of-way or private access easements. At this time, the EPA has not issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the remediation project or any Natural Resource Damages (NRD) settlement. As such the extent and design of the retained/reestablished and/or expanded wetlands has not been determined. Once the EPA has issued a ROD and the extent of the wetland has been determined, the area included in sensitive areas could be calculated. Until which time this number is identified the City is unable to determine compliance with density for the project site. However, based on gross land area and 4.35 acres in rights-of-way or access easements the current density would be calculated at 40.95 du/ac which is below the maximum of 50 du/ac.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure that the overall site is compliant with the maximum density, staff recommends as a condition of approval that upon the EPA ROD and NRD settlement, a density worksheet shall be submitted to the Current Planning Project Manager identifying compliance with net density for the overall site. Once compliance is identified, the maximum number of units per lot shall be recorded on the final binding site plan to allow the maximum permitted density to be shared among the entire property.</i></p>
✓	<p>Lot Dimensions: There is no minimum lots size, width or depth in the COR zone.</p>
✓	<p>Setbacks: Setback are determined through site plan review in the COR zone.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See the Mitigation Document for setbacks established as mitigation for the subject project. The setbacks identified in the EIS Addendum and Mitigation Document shall be the minimum setback applied to the project, which are as follows:</i></p> <p><i>100 foot setback from the OHWM of Lake Washington - Mitigation Measure B6</i></p> <p><i>40 feet from the site's south boundary (adjacent to Barbee Mill) - Mitigation Measure E1</i></p> <p><i>38 feet from the site's north boundary (adjacent to the Seahawk's Training Facility) - Mitigation Measure E1</i></p> <p><i>70 feet from the east boundary as shown on the Preferred Alternative, Site Plan, Exhibit 7.</i></p> <p><i>All setbacks should be measured from the underlying parcel boundaries and the OHWM and not from the edge of the proposed lots in the binding site plan. There are no setbacks required from the edges of the individual lots created as a part of the binding site plan except as noted above.</i></p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Building Standards: The COR zone has a maximum building coverage of 65% of total lot area or 75% if parking is provided within the building or within a parking garage. The maximum building height is 10 stories and/or 125 ft., unless when a building is abutting a lot designated as residential.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Lots 2, 4, and 5 are proposed to contain some surface parking stalls therefore the building coverage maximum for these lots would be 65%. Specific calculations per lot would be identified at Site Specific Site Plan Review. Based on the calculations provided on the site plan, Exhibit 7, the total impervious area would be</i></p>

	<p>665,548 SF (15.27 acres) which equates to approximately 72% of the site and the total overall building coverage would be 392,976 SF (9.02 acres) or 42.47% building coverage for the overall project, which would be compliant with building coverage maximums. Based on the proposed Preferred Alternative, it appears Lot 3 may exceed the maximum building coverage per code, as currently designed. However, based on the overall building coverage standards above, if Lot 3 is developed in combination with another lot the two lot coverages could be combined to identify compliance with the overall site coverage. To ensure compliance with building coverage standards staff recommends as a condition of approval that all lots shall meet maximum building lot coverage either individually or combined through site plan review.</p> <p>Building Height was reviewed through the EIS process and the building height shall comply with Mitigation Measure E4, F9, and F11 also as shown on Exhibit 7.</p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Upper Story Setbacks: Buildings or portions of buildings which exceed fifty feet (50') in height shall include upper story setbacks as follows: The minimum setback for a fifth story and succeeding stories shall be ten feet (10') minimum from the preceding story, applicable to each story.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> A number of proposed residential towers would exceed 50 feet in height and would be required to comply with the upper story setback standards. Based on the conceptual elevations, Exhibit 10, it appears the upper stories may not comply with the minimum setback standard. Each individual building would be reviewed for compliance upon lot specific site plan review.</p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Roofline and Façade Modulation: Buildings shall provide vertical and horizontal modulation of roof lines and facades of a minimum of two feet (2') at an interval of a minimum of forty feet (40') on a building face or an equivalent standard which adds interest and quality to the project.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Based on the conceptual elevations, Exhibit 10, it appears the building designs begin provide vertical and horizontal modulation of roof lines and facades however compliance with the minimum standards cannot be determined at master site plan review. Each individual building would be reviewed for compliance with the above standards and Mitigation Measures E3, F1, and F15 upon lot specific site plan review.</p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Landscaping: Onsite landscaping required along street frontages is determined through site plan review.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> As discussed in the mitigation document, Mitigation Measure E1, E2 and F5. The project shall be designed and constructed to provide a partial visual screen between proposed buildings and adjacent uses. The applicant provided a conceptual landscape plan with the Preferred Alternative re-submittal dated 12-16-2015, Exhibit 11. Based on the provided conceptual landscape plan a 20 foot wide landscape buffer is proposed west of Road C and a 10 foot wide landscape buffer is proposed east of road C along the south property line (Barbee Mill Development). A 10 foot wide landscape buffer is proposed west of Road C and a 5 foot wide landscape buffer is proposed east of Road C along the north property line (Seahawk's Training Camp). The proposed preferred alternative would be compliant with Mitigation Measures E1, E2, and F5. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the minimum landscape buffers are maintained along the north and south property line as shown in Exhibit 11.</p> <p>Street frontage landscaping is proposed behind the sidewalk in some portions of Street A and Street B. Street trees are proposed to be placed in tree grades along all Roads A,</p>

	<p><i>B, and C. All street trees are required to be planted at a minimum 2-inch caliper and the tree grates are required to be 4' x 8'. The provided conceptual landscape plan does not comply with the minimum caliper inches and/or tree grates sizes as such staff recommends as a condition of approval that a final detailed landscape plan shall be submitted for review and approval for the common areas prior to application for any lot specific site plan review and shall be installed prior to recording of the binding site plan, unless otherwise approved through a phasing plan.</i></p> <p><i>Landscaping proposed on each individual lot shall be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review. This includes but is not limited to screening landscaping for parking garages, surface parking lot landscape standards, court yard landscape details, and shoreline landscaping, as noted in Mitigation Measures F4, G12 and G13.</i></p>
✓	<p>Tree Retention: The City's adopted Tree Retention and Land Clearing Regulations require the retention of 5 percent of trees in a commercial zone.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: As explained above in FOF 9 and 10, the site conditions are assumed post site remediation. As such, it is assumed that no trees would remain on the site following remediation, therefore zero trees are located on the project site. The provided landscape plan identifies new trees would be planted throughout the site, therefore the project is compliant with the minimum tree retention standards.</i></p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review or as conditioned	<p>Parking: The following parking ratios apply to the proposed development:</p> <p>Attached dwellings: A minimum of 1.8 per 3 bedroom or larger unit, 1.6 per 2 bedroom unit, and 1.2 per 1 bedroom or studio unit.</p> <p>Eating and Drinking Establishments: A minimum of 1 per 100 SF of net floor area</p> <p>Retail Sales: A maximum of 0.4 per 100 SF of net floor area</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The overall project includes 692 residential units, however the application did not identify if these units were studio, 1, 2, or 3 bedroom units. As such the minimum parking standard could not specifically be calculated. However, assuming a minimum requirement of 1.8 per unit a total of 1,246 stalls may be required for the proposed residential.</i></p> <p><i>For both the restaurant and retail areas net square footage was not provided therefore specific minimum and maximum parking standards could not be calculated. However, based on gross SF a minimum of 90 stalls would be required for the 9,000 SF of restaurant and a maximum of 80 stalls would be required for the 20,025 SF of retail component. Together all three uses could require up to 1,416 parking stalls.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the provided parking plan, Exhibit 8, a total of 1,366 parking stalls are proposed across the site, in both structured parking garages and surface parking lots. Overall, the site appears to have capacity to meet minimum and/or maximum parking standards per code. Mitigation Measure H6, requires compliance with minimum off street parking standards of the RMC. Compliance with the minimum standards, Mitigation Measure H6, minimum stall and aisle dimensions, ADA standards, and parking lot landscaping standards would be reviewed in detail at site plan review.</i></p> <p><i>As noted in Mitigation Measure F12, the required amount of parking may be reduced, relocated and/or redesigned through transportation demand management (TDM) or other means to allow for an enhanced aesthetic character at the ground level and pedestrian experience. In addition Mitigation Measure H7 requires the implementation of TDM and shared parking agreements between uses to reduce parking demand</i></p>

	<p>during peak period. A TDM program and/or a shared parking agreement was not included with the master site plan application materials. As such, staff recommends as a mitigation measure that a TDM program and draft shared parking agreement become a submittal requirement of site specific site plan review, identifying compliance with Mitigation Measures H7 and F12.</p> <p>On street parking is included in the proposed overall project design on Streets A, B and C. The on street parking shall be maintained as public parking and not allocated to a specific use within the proposed development. In addition, Mitigation Measure G4, requires public parking be provided for the public trail to be located along the shoreline. This parking shall be located in the same general area as the retail/restaurant parking and the applicant is required to specifically identify the parking prior to site plan approval. The provided parking plan does not specifically identify the public parking therefore staff recommends as a condition of approval that a parking plan be provided specifically identifying public parking for the proposed shoreline trail, in compliance with Mitigation Measure G4, for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Park Planning and Natural Resources Director.</p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Screening: Surface Mounted Equipment, Roof-top Equipment, and outdoor storage, loading, repair, maintenance and work areas shall be screened pursuant to RMC 4-4-095.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Detailed screening standards would be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review.</p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Refuse and Recycling: Multi-family developments require a minimum of 1.5 SF per dwelling unit in multi-family residences shall be provided for recyclables deposit areas and a minimum of 3 SF per dwelling unit shall be provided for refuse deposit areas. A total minimum area of 80 SF shall be provided for refuse and recyclables deposit areas.</p> <p>Retail development require a minimum of 5 SF per every 1,000 SF of building gross floor area for recyclables deposit areas and a minimum of 10 SF per 1,000 SF of building gross floor area shall be provided for refuse deposit areas. A total minimum area of one hundred square feet shall be provided for recycling and refuse deposit areas.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Based on 692 residential units 1,038 SF of recyclables deposit areas and 2,076 SF of refuse deposit areas shall be provided for the overall project. Based on a proposal for a 9,000 SF of restaurant and 20,025 SF of retail a combined total of 145.13 SF for recyclables deposit areas and 290.25 Sf of refuse deposit areas shall be provided for the overall project. The application materials did not identify an area for refuses and recycling on the project site. Detailed compliance with these standards would be reviewed at lot specific site plan review.</p>

24. **Design District Review:** The project site is located within Design District 'C'. The following table contains project elements intended to comply with the standards of the Design District 'C' Standards and Guidelines, as outlined in RMC 4-3-100.E. It should be noted that a large number of the design standards will be deferred to lot specific site plan review as they do not apply at the Master Site Plan stage. Those standards that apply have been incorporated below, otherwise a note is provided indicated the standards of a particular subsection will be deferred to site plan review. However, even if a specific design standard is reviewed at Master Site Plan review stage the same standard shall be reviewed again for compliance with the Master Site Plan at lot specific site plan review.

Compliance	Design District Guideline and Standard Analysis
1. SITE DESIGN AND BUILDING LOCATION: Intent: To ensure that buildings are located in relation to streets and other buildings so that the Vision of the City of Renton can be realized for a high-density urban environment; so that businesses enjoy visibility from public rights-of-way; and to encourage pedestrian activity.	
a. Site Design and Street Pattern: Intent: To ensure that the City of Renton vision can be realized within the Urban Center Districts; plan districts that are organized for efficiency while maintaining flexibility for future development at high urban densities and intensities of use; create and maintain a safe convenient network of streets of varying dimensions for vehicle circulation and provide service to businesses.	
✓	Standard: Provide a network of public and/or private local street in addition to public arterials. Staff Comment: <i>The proposed master site plan identifies Roads A – E in a gridded network. Road A connects to N 42nd Place that connects with Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) to connect to the overall City street grid.</i>
✓	Standard: Maintain a hierarchy of streets to provide organized circulation that promotes use by multiple transportation modes and to avoid overburdening the roadway system. The hierarchy shall consist of (from greatest in size to smallest): (a) High Visibility Street. A highly visible arterial street that warrants special design treatment to improve its appearance and maintain its transportation function. (b) Arterial Street. A street classified as principal arterial on the City's Arterial Street Plan. (c) Pedestrian-Oriented Streets. Streets that are intended to feature a concentration of pedestrian activity. Such streets feature slow moving traffic, narrow travel lanes, on-street parking, and wide sidewalks. (d) Internal or local road (public or private) Staff Comment: <i>The provided master site plan has three "pedestrian oriented streets" Streets A, B, and C. Roads D and E would be classified as internal or local roads, private. Based on the proposed hierarchy of streets that provide organized circulation the project is compliant with the standards. However, to ensure that at individual site plan review each building is designed in accordance with the standards applied to each street, staff recommends as a condition of approval that the street classification is noted on the binding site plan.</i>
b. Building Location and Orientation: <i>Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.</i> Intent: To ensure visibility of businesses and to establish active, lively uses along sidewalks and pedestrian pathways. To organize buildings for pedestrian use and so that natural light is available to other structures and open space. To ensure an appropriate transition between buildings, parking areas, and other land uses; and increase privacy for residential uses.	
Compliance to be determined	Standard: Buildings shall contain pedestrian-oriented uses, feature "pedestrian-oriented facades," and have clear connections to the sidewalk, if located on pedestrian

at Site Plan Review	<p>oriented streets.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: A building facades proposed along Streets A, B, and C shall have pedestrian-oriented facades. Based on the conceptual elevations provided some buildings would begin to comply with the above standard. However, it should be noted that a significant length of Road A and C features parking structures and do not feature pedestrian oriented uses such as retail. Staff encourages the addition of pedestrian oriented uses at the ground level to be added at site plan review to increase compliance with the above intent, guideline and standards, it should also be noted that the analysis completed in the EIS would allow for the addition of commercial uses at the ground floor.</i></p>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Standard: Buildings that do not have a pedestrian-oriented facades they shall have landscaping between the sidewalk and building. Such landscaping shall be at least ten feet (10') in width as measured from the sidewalk.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: As noted above a significant portion of the ground floor of all the proposed buildings would be structure parking garages and would not feature pedestrian-oriented uses. As such, these portions shall be screened with a minimum of 10 feet of landscaping measured from the back of the sidewalk to the building facade.</i></p>
<p>c. Building Entries: Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.</p> <p>Intent: To make building entrances convenient to locate and easy to access, and ensure that building entries further the pedestrian nature of the fronting sidewalk and the urban character of the district.</p>	
<p>d. Service Element Location and Design: Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.</p> <p>Intent: To reduce the potential negative impacts of service elements (i.e., waste receptacles, loading docks) by locating service and loading areas away from high-volume pedestrian areas, and screening them from view in high visibility areas.</p>	
<p>e. Gateways:</p> <p>Intent: To distinguish gateways as primary entrances to districts or to the City, special design features and architectural elements at gateways should be provided. While gateways should be distinctive within the context of the district, they should also be compatible with the district in form and scale.</p>	
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Developments located at district gateways shall be marked with visually prominent features.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The Quendall Terminals site is located at the Gateway to not only the Kenndale Neighborhood from I-405 but is also is Gateway to the entire City of Renton from the north. Mitigation measure F14 requires that design features such as public art, special landscape treatment, additional open space/plaza, landmark building form, etc. be provided to further enhance the gateway/landmark features on the site. The re-submitted Preferred Alternative did not provide any additional gateway feature as required in mitigation measure F14 nor does the resubmittal comply with the subject design standards. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a "gateway feature" package be prepared for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager. If such gateway features would be considered common amenities such as public art or entry elements these shall be installed pursuant to condition of approval 3.</i></p>
Compliant if condition	Standard Gateway elements shall be oriented toward and scaled for both pedestrians

of approval is met	and vehicles. <u>Staff Comment:</u> See comments above.
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Visual prominence shall be distinguished by two (2) or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Public art 2) Monuments; 3) Special landscape treatment; 4) Open space/plaza; 5) Identifying building form; 6) Special paving, unique pedestrian scale lighting, or bollards; 7) Prominent architectural features (trellis, arbor, pergola, or gazebo); 8) Neighborhood or district entry identification (commercial signs do not qualify). <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See comments above.</p>
<p>2. PARKING AND VEHICULAR ACCESS:</p> <p>Intent: To provide safe, convenient access to the Urban Center and the Center Village; incorporate various modes of transportation, including public mass transit, in order to reduce traffic volumes and other impacts from vehicles; ensure sufficient parking is provided, while encouraging creativity in reducing the impacts of parking areas; allow an active pedestrian environment by maintaining contiguous street frontages, without parking lot siting along sidewalks and building facades; minimize the visual impact of parking lots; and use access streets and parking to maintain an urban edge to the district.</p>	
<p>a. Surface Parking:</p> <p>Intent: To maintain active pedestrian environments along streets by placing parking lots primarily in back of buildings.</p>	
✓	<p>Standard: Parking shall be at the side and/or rear of a building and may not occur between the building and the street. However, if due to the constraints of the site, parking cannot be provided at the side or rear of the building, the Administrator may allow parking to occur between the building and the street. If parking is allowed to occur between the building and the street, no more than sixty feet (60') of the street frontage measured parallel to the curb shall be occupied by off-street parking and vehicular access.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Parking is not provided between the buildings and the designated Pedestrian Oriented Streets, A, B, and C. Parking is provided between the buildings and private street D and E. The design of individual surface parking lots would be reviewed at the time of each lot specific site plan review and landscaping and screening will be required to be incorporated into the site specific design review. The location of the surface parking lots meets the intent of the standards.</p>
✓	<p>Standard: On Designated Pedestrian Oriented Streets on-street parallel parking shall be required on both sides of the street.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Parallel parking is provided on Roads A, B, and C. See further discussion below under FOF 26, Master Site Plan Review.</p>
Meets	Standard: Surface parking lots shall be designed to facilitate future structured parking

exception	<p>and/or other infill development. For example, provision of a parking lot with a minimum dimension on one side of two hundred feet (200') and one thousand five hundred feet (1,500') maximum perimeter area. Exception: If there are size constraints inherent in the original parcel.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The master site plan identifies surface parking lots that do not meet the standard dimension above to demonstrate future structured parking. However, the subject parcel is constrained by both Lake Washington shoreline setback of 100 feet and an odd shape along the south property line. Furthermore, the surface parking lots are located along the north and south property lines to address public comment and concern related to bulk and scale, access to views, and access to light and air as evaluated in the EIS, Exhibit 2. As such, the proposed surface parking meets the exception standards for inherent constraints of the site.</i></p>
<p>b. Structured Parking Garages: With the exception of the standard noted below, compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.</p> <p>Intent: To promote more efficient use of land needed for vehicle parking; encourage the use of structured parking; physically and visually integrate parking garages with other uses; and reduce the overall impact of parking garages.</p>	
Intent of the standard is met with conditions of approval	<p>Standard: Parking Structures Fronting Designated Pedestrian-Oriented Streets</p> <p>(a) Parking structures shall provide space for ground floor commercial uses along street frontages at a minimum of seventy five percent (75%) of the building frontage width.</p> <p>(b) The entire façade must feature a pedestrian-oriented façade.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Streets A, B, and C should be considered pedestrian oriented streets as noted above. However, special circumstance apply to the subject site that limit the developments ability to provide below grade parking, particularly environmental health concerns related to the sites soil contamination (more information can be found in Exhibit 2, DEIS). Due to these special circumstances the proposed master site plan with commercial uses located primarily along Road B would be compliant with the intent of the design standard if sufficient landscape screening is provided between the structured parking and the pedestrian oriented street. Ten feet of screening landscaping is required along high visibility streets, using a similar standard 10 feet should be provided to screen the above ground parking garages. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that either commercial uses are provided along the street frontages of roads A, B, and C or a minimum 10 foot landscape screen is located between the sidewalk and the parking garage.</i></p>
<p>c. Vehicular Access:</p> <p>Intent: To maintain a contiguous and uninterrupted sidewalk by minimizing, consolidating, and/or eliminating vehicular access off streets.</p>	
Intent of the standard is met with conditions of approval	<p>Standard: Parking garages shall be accessed at the rear of buildings.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The site plan is designed to provide access to the parking garages from Road C at six locations, access to the two parking decks are proposed from Road A at two locations and access to the surface parking lots can be gained from both the private streets D and E or Road C. Each additional curb cut interrupts the sidewalk minimizing consolidated safe pedestrian walkways. Based on the site constraints, i.e. bordered on one side by Lake Washington and the other by an old rail corridor some curb cuts can be</i></p>

	<i>expected along Roads A and C, no curb cuts should be permitted along Road B. Furthermore, the parking decks are accessed separately then the ground level parking garages, the parking decks could be accessed internally from the ground level parking garages to consolidate access points. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that curb cuts be reduced to the minimum necessary to improve uninterrupted pedestrian mobility along Road A and C and curb cuts should not be permitted along Road B. If the project complies with the condition of approval the intent of the guideline has been met.</i>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Parking lot entrances, driveways, and other vehicular access points shall be restricted to one entrance and exit lane per five hundred (500) linear feet as measured horizontally along the street.</p> <p>Staff Comment: Based on the provided site plan, parking lot entrances are closer than 500 linear feet. As such, these entrances spaces shall be reduced to meet the standard. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that vehicular access points be restricted to one entrance and exit per 500 linear feet as measured horizontally along the street.</p>
3. PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT: Intent: To enhance the urban character of development in the Urban Center and the Center Village by creating pedestrian networks and by providing strong links from streets and drives to building entrances; make the pedestrian environment safer and more convenient, comfortable, and pleasant to walk between businesses, on sidewalks, to and from access points, and through parking lots; and promote the use of multi-modal and public transportation systems in order to reduce other vehicular traffic.	
a. Pedestrian Circulation and pathways to parking lots: Intent: To create a network of linkages for pedestrians to improve safety and convenience and enhance the pedestrian environment and provide safe pedestrian connections to buildings, parking garages, and parking lots.	
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: A pedestrian circulation system of pathways that are clearly delineated and connect buildings, open space, and parking areas with the sidewalk system and abutting properties shall be provided.</p> <p>(a) Pathways shall be located so that there are clear sight lines, to increase safety.</p> <p>(b) Pathways shall be an all-weather or permeable walking surface, unless the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed surface is appropriate for the anticipated number of users and complementary to the design of the development.</p> <p>Staff Comment: The provided site plan includes a number of pedestrian connection via sidewalks along street frontages and a pedestrian trail along the shoreline. However, based on the provided site plan some key connections are missing. For example the sidewalk along the west edge of Road C does not continue along the private street E either north or south. To the west is the trail connection and to the east is the access point to Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way). Again you see the same missing connection along the south edge along Street E, at the terminus of Road C. Additionally, the residential court yards show stairways along the Lake side of the development but no stairways are provided for the buildings east of the lake. In order to ensure the overall site maintains a pedestrian circulation system of pathways that is clearly delineated and connects buildings, open space, parking areas, and existing public roads, and provides for public safety staff recommends as a condition of approval that an updated site plan is provided identifying a complete connected pedestrian pathway system for</p>

	<i>review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and shall demonstrate compliance with mitigation measure H3. The approved pedestrian pathway system shall be shown on the binding site plan upon recording.</i>
Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review	<p>Standard: Pathways within parking areas shall be provided and differentiated by material or texture (i.e., raised walkway, stamped concrete, or pavers) from abutting paving materials. Permeable materials are encouraged. The pathways shall be perpendicular to the applicable building facade and no greater than one hundred fifty feet (150') apart.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>To be reviewed for compliance at lot specific site plan review.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Sidewalks and pathways along the facades of buildings shall be of sufficient width to accommodate anticipated numbers of users. Specifically:</p> <p>(a) Sidewalks and pathways along the facades of mixed use and retail buildings 100 or more feet in width (measured along the facade) shall provide sidewalks at least 12 feet in width. The walkway shall include an 8 foot minimum unobstructed walking surface.</p> <p>(b) Interior pathways shall be provided and shall vary in width to establish a hierarchy. The widths shall be based on the intended number of users; to be no smaller than five feet (5') and no greater than twelve feet (12').</p> <p>(c) For all other interior pathways, the proposed walkway shall be of sufficient width to accommodate the anticipated number of users.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>Pursuant to mitigation measure G6, 15 foot wide sidewalks shall be provided along Street B. All other sidewalks shall meet the minimum standards as identified in the Transportation Section, FOF 26 and Exhibit 16.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Mid-block connections between buildings shall be provided.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>The provided site plan identifies 11 crossings along Road C, 3 along Road B, and 4 to the center of each round about. However, no crosswalks are provided across Road A to access Lake Washington Blvd. or Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way). Crosswalks shall be included in the pedestrian circulation plan as conditioned above to evaluate pedestrian safety and vehicular mobility.</i></p>
<p>b. Pedestrian Amenities: <i>Compliance to be reviewed at lot specific site plan review.</i></p> <p>Intent: To create attractive spaces that unify the building and street environments and are inviting and comfortable for pedestrians; and provide publicly accessible areas that function for a variety of activities, at all times of the year, and under typical seasonal weather conditions.</p>	
<p>4. LANDSCAPING, RECREATION AREAS AND COMMON OPEN SPACE:</p> <p>Intent: To provide visual relief in areas of expansive paving or structures; define logical areas of pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and add to the aesthetic enjoyment of the area b the community. To have areas suitable for both passive and active recreation by residents, workers, and visitors; provide these areas in sufficient amounts and in safe and convenient locations; and provide the opportunity for community gathering in places centrally located and designed to encourage such activity.</p>	
<p>a. Landscaping: <i>With the exception of the standard noted below, compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.</i></p> <p>Intent: Landscaping is intended to reinforce the architecture of concept of an area; provide visual</p>	

and climatic relief in areas of expansive paving or structures; channelize and define logical areas of pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and add to the aesthetic enjoyment of the area by the community.

✓	Standard: On Pedestrian-oriented streets, street trees shall be installed with tree grates.
---	--

Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Underground, automatic irrigation systems are required in all landscape areas.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>An irrigation plan was not submitted with the conceptual landscape plan. An irrigation plan shall be provided for all common landscaping along with the detailed landscape plan for common landscaping, as detailed above in FOF 23, Landscaping. All individual lot landscape plans and associated irrigation plans will be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review.</i></p>
--	--

b. Recreation Areas and Common Open Space:

Intent: To ensure that areas for both passive and active recreation are available to residents, workers, and visitors and that these areas are of sufficient size for the intended activity and in convenient locations. To create usable and inviting open space that is accessible to the public; and to promote pedestrian activity on streets particularly at street corners.

Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: All mixed use residential and attached housing developments of ten (10) or more dwelling units shall provide common opens space and/or recreation areas equal to fifty (50) SF per unit. The area shall be aggregated and usable for residents, subject to the approval of the Director. One or more of the following shall be include when a part of a development of more than 100 units.</p> <p>(a) Courtyards, plazas, or multi-purpose open spaces</p> <p>(b) Upper level common decks, patios, terraces, or roof gardens. Such spaces above the street level must feature views or amenities that are unique to the site and are provided as an asset to the development.</p> <p>(c) Pedestrian corridors dedicated to passive recreation and separate from the public street system;</p> <p>(d) Recreation facilities including but not limited to tennis/sports courts, swimming pools, exercise areas, game rooms, or other similar facilities; or</p> <p>(e) Children's play areas.</p> <p>The following shall not be considered common open space:</p> <p>(a) Required landscaping, driveways, parking or vehicular use areas;</p> <p>(b) Yard setback areas</p> <p>(c) Private decks, balconies, and ground floor open space/recreation area requirements</p> <p>(d) Landscaping and sensitive area buffers without common access links, such as pedestrian trails.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>Based on the completed mitigation document, mitigation measure G12 requires landscaped plaza areas on top of the parking garages. The provided landscape plan, identifies compliance with mitigation measure G12, and provides 2.7 acres of plaza space. Based on the provided the site plan and landscape plan (Exhibit 7 and 11) the plaza spaces provide a generic passive recreation plaza space which only</i></p>
--	---

contains landscaping. These plaza areas could provide other amenities to the residences such as children's play areas, swimming pools, bocce ball courts, eating areas, water features, or other amenities. To ensure these spaces meet the intent of the design district a detailed design of these areas shall be submitted with lot specific site plan review. Each plaza area shall provide a unique space that includes both landscaping and amenities as approved by the Director.

Mitigation Measure G8 requires 1.8 acres of indoor and/or outdoor areas for active recreating, such as Frisbee, swimming pools, tot lots, exercise rooms, or active recreation areas in the courtyards. Active recreation areas were not identified in the re-submitted application materials to identify compliance with mitigation measure G8. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that either the site plan is updated to identify 1.8 acres of active recreation area or a plan is provided to identify which portion of the 1.8 acres would be allocated to which lot prior to lot specific site plan review.

5. BUILDING ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN:

Intent: To encourage building design that is unique and urban in character, comfortable on a human scale, and uses appropriate building materials that are suitable for the Pacific Northwest climate. To discourage franchise retail architecture.

a. Building Character and Massing: *Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.*

Intent: To ensure that buildings are not bland and visually appear to be at a human scale; and ensure that all sides of a building, that can be seen by the public, are visually interesting.

b. Ground-Level Details: *Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.*

Intent: To ensure that buildings are visually interesting and reinforce the intended human-scale character of the pedestrian environment; and ensure that all sides of a building within near or distant public view have visual interest.

c. Building Roof Lines: *Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.*

Intent: To ensure that roof forms provide distinctive profiles and interest consistent with an urban project and contribute to the visual continuity of the district.

d. Building Materials: *Compliance to be determined at Site Plan Review.*

Intent: To ensure high standards of quality and effective maintenance over time; encourage the use of materials that reduce the visual bulk of large buildings; and encourage the use of materials that add visual interest to the neighborhood.

5. SIGNAGE:

Intent: To provide a means of identifying and advertising businesses; provide directional assistance; encourage signs that are both clear and of appropriate scale for the project; encourage quality signage that contributes to the character of the Urban Center and the Center Village; and create color and interest.

Staff Comment: A signage package was not included with the application materials. The signage of the overall development should be coordinated with the building design and should consider both the residential development and the retail and restaurant business that are proposed to be located throughout the site. To ensure that all uses receive equal signage opportunities staff recommends as a condition of approval that an overall sign design package shall be submitted for review and

<i>approval by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to the approval of any sign permit for the site.</i>	
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Entry signs shall be limited to the name of the larger development.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Corporate logos and signs shall be sized appropriately for their location.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: In mixed use and multi-use buildings, signage shall be coordinated with the overall building design.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Freestanding ground-related monument signs, with the exception of primary entry signs, shall be limited to five feet (5') above finished grade, including support structure.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Freestanding signs shall include decorative landscaping (ground cover and/or shrubs) to provide seasonal interest in the area surrounding the sign. Alternately, signage may incorporate stone, brick, or other decorative materials as approved by the Director.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: All of the following are prohibited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pole signs; b. Roof signs; and c. Back-lit signs with letters or graphics on a plastic sheet (can signs or illuminated cabinet signs). Exceptions: Back-lit logo signs less than ten (10) square feet are permitted as area signs with only the individual letters back-lit (see illustration, subsection G8 of this Section). <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under 5. Signage.</i></p>
<p>6. LIGHTING:</p> <p>Intent: To ensure safety and security; provide adequate lighting levels in pedestrian areas such as plazas, pedestrian walkways, parking areas, building entries, and other public places; and increase the visual attractiveness of the area at all times of the day and night.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Lighting proposed on each individual building shall be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review for compliance with the design standards below for lighting and mitigation measure F13. At that time, the lighting design should consider mitigation measures B11 and F7 to ensure adverse lighting effect on wetland, shorelines and riparian habitat is reduced by the use of downlighting and shielding among other techniques.</i></p> <p><i>However, common site lighting shall be incorporated into the design of the pedestrian walkways and</i></p>	

roadways, gateway features, public art, special landscape treatment, open space/plaza, and other common areas, as required by mitigation measures F13 and H9 and the design standards. A common site lighting plan was not included in the re-submittal of the Preferred Alternative therefore staff could not verify compliance with mitigation measures F13 and H9 or compliance with the design standards. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a site lighting plan be provided identifying compliance with mitigation measure F13 and H9 and the design standards for the common areas for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager, the Public Works Department, and Community Services.

Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Pedestrian-scale lighting shall be provided at primary and secondary building entrances. Examples include sconces on building facades, awnings with down-lighting and decorative street lighting.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See comments above under 6. Lighting.</p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Accent lighting shall also be provided on building facades (such as sconces) and/or to illuminate other key elements of the site such as gateways, specimen trees, other significant landscaping, water features, and/or artwork.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See comments above under 6. Lighting.</p>
Compliant if condition of approval is met	<p>Standard: Downlighting shall be used in all cases to assure safe pedestrian and vehicular movement, unless alternative pedestrian scale lighting has been approved administratively or is specifically listed as exempt from provisions located in RMC 4-4-075, Lighting, Exterior On-Site (i.e., signage, governmental flags, temporary holiday or decorative lighting, right-of-way-lighting, etc.).</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See comments above under 6. Lighting.</p>

25. Critical Areas:

- a. Project sites which contain critical areas are required to comply with the Critical Areas Regulations (RMC 4-3-050). As noted above in FOF 9 and 10 an assumed baseline condition has been established for the Quendall Terminals development, see DEIS pages 3.2-2 for details on wetland baseline conditions. The outcome of the EPA's ROD and NRD Settlement would specifically identify the extent and design of the retained/reestablished and/or expanded wetlands and critical areas on the project site. It is assumed at this phase of the development that the proposed project would not result in impacts to the recreated wetlands and/or their buffers, see Mitigation Measure B4. Once the ROD and NRD Settlement has been established and recreated wetlands and other critical areas are known, the proposed impacts to these areas should be specifically reviewed at the time of site plan review for compliance with critical areas regulations. The DEIS assumes wetland buffer averaging would be used to ensure no impacts of wetland buffers on adjacent properties as a result of habitat restoration. The site specific site plan review should include an analysis of the wetland buffer averaging criteria and the project compliance with the criteria if buffer averaging is used. If the ROD and NRD Settlement results in the project's inability to comply with the critical area regulations as currently designed and assumed in the baseline conditions (i.e. the buffers of the recreated wetlands can be averaged within proposed lots 1 and 6), Lots 1 and 6 shall be increased to ensure compliance with the critical areas regulations and ensure that all wetlands and associated buffers are contained in what will become NGPA tracts. If the change to the overall development is considered a Major Adjustment to an approved site development plan per RMC 4-9-200J a new application would be required.

- b. As noted in Mitigation Measure C10, if the EPA issues a ROD that is different than what is assumed in the Quendall Terminals EIS, the City reviewing officials shall determine whether the applicant shall be required to prepare additional SEPA review to address any difference between the ROD and the assumptions in the EIS. Such differences could include impacts to reestablished critical areas beyond buffer averaging. To ensure a true baseline condition is known at the time of site plan review or construction permit application and prior to recording of the binding site plan, staff recommends a condition of approval that a site plan application, construction permit application or the recording of the Binding Site shall not be submitted to the City for Review and approval prior to a ROD and NRD Settlement completed by the EPA.
- c. The proposal is consistent with the Critical Areas Regulations, if all conditions of approval are complied with.

26. **Master Site Plan Review:** Pursuant to RMC 4-9-200.B, Master Site Plan Review is required for development in the COR zoning classification when a project is not exempt from Environmental (SEPA) Review. For Master Plan applications compliance with the review criteria for Master Site Plans are analyzed at a general level of detail to ensure nothing would preclude the development of the Site Plan. Given Site Plan applications are evaluated for compliance with the specific requirements of the RMC 4-9-200.E.3 the following table contains project elements intended to comply with level of detail needed for a Master Site Plan request:

Compliance	Site Plan Criteria and Analysis
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>a. Comprehensive Plan Compliance and consistency.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See previous discussion under FOF 22, Comprehensive Plan Analysis.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>b. Zoning Compliance and Consistency.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See discussion under FOF 23, Zoning Development Standard Compliance.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>c. Design Regulation Compliance and Consistency.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See discussion under FOF 24, Design District Review.</p>
N/A	d. Planned action ordinance and Development agreement Compliance and Consistency.
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>e. Off Site Impacts.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Off-site impacts were extensively evaluated through the DEIS and EIS Addendum process. The Preferred Alternative proposal was formulated by the applicants based on information provided in the DEIS, comments from agencies and the public, input and continued coordination between the applicant and the City, and additional analysis. Under the preferred alternative redevelopment assumptions were amended in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoreline Setback – increased to 100 feet. • Setbacks from Adjacent Properties • View Corridors • Building Height Modulations • Open Space and Related Areas • Building Design • Emergency Access

	<p><i>For a detailed analysis of the changes see Exhibit 2, EIS Addendum pages 2-12 – 2-14 and Figures 2-5 – 2-9.</i></p> <p>Structures: Restricting overscale structures and overconcentration of development on a particular portion of the site.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> As evaluated in the EIS, both building massing and building height were analyzed for impacts on adjacent properties. As a result mitigation measures E3, E4, F1, F8, F9, F11, and F15 were established. Provided the project complies with these mitigation measures which address setbacks from adjacent properties and Lake Washington, building height, and building modulation, the Preferred Alternative proposed would not result in an overconcentration of development on any particular portion of the site.</p> <p>Circulation: Providing desirable transitions and linkages between uses, streets, walkways and adjacent properties.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> See FOF 24, Design Review: 2. Parking and Vehicular Access, subsection c. Vehicular Access and 3. Pedestrian Environment.</p> <p>Loading and Storage Areas: Locating, designing and screening storage areas, utilities, rooftop equipment, loading areas, and refuse and recyclables to minimize views from surrounding properties.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> Detailed screening standards would be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review. Based on the provided Master Plan there are no large loading areas that would include loading docks. It is anticipated that the site would demand a level of delivery for the retail and restaurant uses, that could be accommodated in the parking garages or the private roadways at off peak hours.</p> <p>Views: Recognizing the public benefit and desirability of maintaining visual accessibility to attractive natural features.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> The subject site is located along the shores of Lake Washington. The current site is vacant and allows for expansive views to the neighboring properties as well as the public right-of-way, Lake Washington Blvd., Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way), and N 44th St. The addition of multi-story structures and development on the site will impact views from the surrounding area. These impacts were evaluated in the DEIS and the EIS Addendum, Exhibit 2, specifically section 3.7 of the DEIS and section 3.2 of the EIS Addendum. As a result of this analysis the Preferred Alternative was developed with a wider Road B to provide a grand view corridor down the center of the site. In addition, larger setbacks were established from the south and north edges of the property. Finally, the residential towers are separated with plaza space on top of the parking garage to allow for additional view corridor through the development from the public rights-of-way and the development located on the hill behind the subject site. Mitigation Measures F1 – F15 were established to minimize impacts to both aesthetics and views. To ensure the east west view corridor are maintained staff recommends as a condition of approval that Road B shall maintain a minimum width of 74 feet and that the plaza spaces on top of the parking garages shall maintain a minimum width of 80 feet.</p> <p>Landscaping: Using landscaping to provide transitions between development and surrounding properties to reduce noise and glare, maintain privacy, and generally enhance the appearance of the project.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> See discussion under FOF 23, Zoning Development Standard:</p>
--	---

Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<i>Landscaping.</i>
	Lighting: Designing and/or placing exterior lighting and glazing in order to avoid excessive brightness or glare to adjacent properties and streets.
	<i>Staff Comment: See Lighting discussion under FOF 24, Design Review: Lighting.</i>
	f. On Site Impacts.
	<p>Structure Placement: Provisions for privacy and noise reduction by building placement, spacing and orientation.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The proposed building layout provides semi-private court yards between each residential tower which would allow access to light and air in each unit, in addition adequate separation for privacy. The 80-foot wide plaza corridors allow for a large number of residential units to have an opportunity for views of Lake Washington. For those units located over Road B and the retail/restaurant area some additional noise could be anticipated due to the active street. Specifics of noise reduction and privacy would be reviewed at lot specific site plan review, such as window coverings and an evaluation specific uses proposed in the court yard spaces.</i></p> <p>Structure Scale: Consideration of the scale of proposed structures in relation to natural characteristics, views and vistas, site amenities, sunlight, prevailing winds, and pedestrian and vehicle needs.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The proposed building design includes parking structures on the ground floor. It is assumed that the EPA ROD would not permit sub-grade parking as such above grade parking would be required. The proposed parking structures have been conditioned to be screened with a minimum of 10 feet of landscaping where they front a road. However, the parking garages will also be visible from Lake Washington if you are walking on the proposed trail, a public promenade, boating, or live across the Lake on Mercer Island. These parking garages are not designed to have a relation to the natural characteristics of the shoreline and appear to wall off the lake from the development. Conceptual elevations were provided depicting the building elevation as seen from Lake Washington, Exhibit 10. Based on the conceptual elevations it is clear that the parking garage becomes the dominate structure and aesthetic seen from the Lake Washington. In order to ensure the structures on the lake maintain a relationship to the natural characteristic and site amenities (trail, etc.) staff recommends a condition of approval that the east elevations shall be re-designed to reduce the parking garage walls from the view along the lake. An artistic rendering was provided in the EIS Addendum, Figure 2-8 that depicts a view of the development from Lake Washington. In this rendering walls are minimized by landscape screening and berming along the shoreline. In addition to architectural treatments landscape treatments could be employed to reduce the parking garage walls along the Lake side of the development.</i></p> <p>Natural Features: Protection of the natural landscape by retaining existing vegetation and soils, using topography to reduce undue cutting and filling, and limiting impervious surfaces.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See FOF 9 and 10, which provides an explanation of the baseline conditions on the site.</i></p> <p>Landscaping: Use of landscaping to soften the appearance of parking areas, to provide shade and privacy where needed, to define and enhance open spaces, and generally to enhance the appearance of the project. Landscaping also includes the</p>

	<p>design and protection of planting areas so that they are less susceptible to damage from vehicles or pedestrian movements.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See FOF 23, Zoning Development Standard: Landscaping.</i></p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>g. Access</p>
	<p>Location and Consolidation: Providing access points on side streets or frontage streets rather than directly onto arterial streets and consolidation of ingress and egress points on the site and, when feasible, with adjacent properties.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The overall development has two primary access locations, one from Lake Washington Blvd. N at N 42nd Place and a second from Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way). Both access locations cross the King County owned rail road right of way. There is an existing crossing of the rail road right of way at N 42nd Place but no existing crossing from Ripley Lane. To ensure there are two primary access points to the development, the applicant would be required to receive approval from King County to construct a second crossing across the rail-road right-of-way. This crossing shall include a pedestrian connection to Ripley Lane via a sidewalk. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that documentation be provided to the City identifying rights to construct a crossing for vehicles and pedestrians prior to site plan review application and construction permit application submittal. Also See FOF 24, Design Review: 2. Parking and Vehicular Access, subsection c. Vehicular Access and 3. Pedestrian Environment.</i></p>
	<p>Internal Circulation: Promoting safety and efficiency of the internal circulation system, including the location, design and dimensions of vehicular and pedestrian access points, drives, parking, turnarounds, walkways, bikeways, and emergency access ways.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See FOF 24, Design Review: 2. Parking and Vehicular Access, subsection c. Vehicular Access and 3. Pedestrian Environment.</i></p>
	<p>Transit and Bicycles: Providing transit, carpools and bicycle facilities and access.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Transit was evaluated as a part of the DEIS and EIS Addendum. Currently no public transit service is provided to the Quendall Terminals site. The closest transit service to the site is provided via a dial-a-ride service area fixed route service in the vicinity of the NE 30th St. interchange and I-405. Future potential public transportation in the vicinity could include Bus Rapid Transit on I-405 planned by Sound Transit and WSDOT with a flyer stop at the I-405/NE 44th Street interchange. Mitigation measure H3 and H9 require that provisions for safe pedestrian circulation shall be provided to encourage future transit usage to and from the site when planned public transit becomes available. The pedestrian connectivity plan required as a condition of approval should include pedestrian connections to the public right of way, Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) to meet this mitigation measure.</i></p> <p><i>Currently there are no non-motorized transportation facilities on the Quendall Terminals site, however there are striped bike lanes on Lake Washington Blvd. In addition, the existing rail road right-of-way to the east of the site was recently purchased by King County and is identified in the City of Renton Trails and Bicycle Master Plan as a future "rails to trails" planned multi-purpose trail corridor. In February 2016, a DEIS was issued evaluating alternatives for the East Side Rail Corridor which continues to include a multi-purpose trail at this location. Considering, the site</i></p>

	<p>does not currently have public transit options the primary form and most readily available form of alternative non-motorized transportation is bicycles. Staff anticipates that residents of the development and visitors to the retail and restaurants proposed at the site would ride bikes. Furthermore, as identified in the Mitigation Document (page 26) to mitigate system-wide transportation impacts on planned vicinity transportation facilities and reduce or control the general vehicular impacts of the project the applicant shall prepare a TDM plan to the satisfaction of the City of Renton that could include on-site bicycle facilities, bike lockers, and public shower facilities. Based on the above analysis, staff recommends a condition of approval that bicycle parking be provided in the form of bike racks for the retail, restaurant, and public trail users in addition to secure weather-protected bike facilities shall be provided for the residential units. Bike parking should be provided at a ratio of 10 percent of the required parking stalls for the retail and restaurant uses and at a ratio of 0.5 stalls per residential unit. Bike parking for the residents shall not be located on balconies or in the unit. In addition, the City's Transportation Division anticipates that individuals utilizing bicycles as a primary form of transportation would not use the multi-purpose trail envisioned along the East Side Rail Corridor, therefore staff recommends as a condition of approval that a bicycle lane shall be constructed on both the north and south side of Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) with or without the construction of the multi-purpose trail.</p>
	<p>Pedestrians: Providing safe and attractive pedestrian connections between parking areas, buildings, public sidewalks and adjacent properties.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 24, Design Review: 3. Pedestrian Environment.</p>
	<p>h. Open Space: Incorporating open spaces to serve as distinctive project focal points and to provide adequate areas for passive and active recreation by the occupants/users of the site.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF X, Design District Compliance: Recreation Areas and Common Open Space.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>i. Design: The plan provides an overall urban design concept that is internally consistent, and provides quality development.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> The proposed overall urban design concept is internally consistent based on the conceptual elevations (Exhibit 10). However, each site specific building is required to undergo site plan review including detailed design review. Additional architectural details and façade treatments will be reviewed and evaluated at that time. To ensure that each building developed on each lot maintains a consistent design concept, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a compatible architectural design shall be maintained throughout the site and that consistency shall be evaluated at site plan review for each building proposed on lots 2, 3, 4, and 5 with each other.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>j. Distinctive Focal Points: The plan provides distinctive focal points such as public area plazas prominent architectural features, or other items.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> The proposed plan contains limited distinctive focal points, no prominent plazas are proposed and architectural features are unknown at this time. The two round about features located in Road B provide limited public focal points on site. These roundabouts could be designed with additional amenities such as art work and/or fountain features to add interest and provide a gateway feature. Based on the provided utility plan, the roundabout located at the intersection of Road B and C has a sewer man hole located in the center. The location of this man hole limits the</p>

	<p>opportunities for this round about to feature a point of visual interest or focal point. However, based on the artistic renderings provided in the EIS Addendum, Figure 2-8 and 2-9 both of these roundabouts would feature a center water fountain. There are a number of inconsistencies in the provided plans and it is difficult to determine if these roundabouts would meet the intent demonstrated in the artistic renderings. The gateway features that could be added to the roundabout however would not provide a plaza space or prominent architectural features, but would provide a gateway feature. To ensure the distinct focal points are provided, staff recommends as a condition of approval that usable public plaza space is provided along Lake Washington and the NW corner of the building on Lot 5 and the SW corner of the building on Lot 2. The details of the design of this space shall be included in the lot specific site plan review for lots 5 and 2.</p>
✓	<p>k. Conservation of Area Wide Property Values</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> The proposed development would add amenities to the area which could add value to area wide properties. View impacts and traffic impacts are also anticipated, which could reduce more localized property values. Overall, the development would facilitate the remediation of a contaminated Superfund site. The improvement to Environmental Heath as a result of cleaning up a Superfund site with the oversight of the EPA is anticipated to add value to area wide property values.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>l. Provision of Adequate Light and Air</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review: f. On site Impacts, Structure Placement.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>m. Mitigation of Noise, Odors and Other Harmful or Unhealthy Conditions</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Due to the sites superfund designation the DEIS evaluated Environmental Heath, section 3.3. As a result of this analysis mitigation measures C1 – C10 were established. The project shall comply with these mitigation measures.</p>
✓	<p>n. Prevention of Neighborhood Deterioration and Blight</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review: k. Conservation of Area Wide Property Values.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>o. Views and Public Access: When possible, providing view corridors to shorelines and Mt. Rainier, and incorporating public access to shorelines</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review: e. Off Site Impacts, Views. The proposal includes a trail along the shoreline to provide public access to the shoreline. This trail could double as a fire lane lane, which means it may likely be 20 feet in width. Based on the assumed outcome of the EPA, ROD and NRD Settlement, it is anticipated that access to the lake shore would not be permitted. However, mitigation measure B10 requires that the proposed shoreline trail includes interpretive viewpoints. Based on the provided drawings details of this trail are not included and the design does not comply with the mitigation measures identified in the mitigation document. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a detailed trail design be submitted for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Community Services Department prior to site specific site plan review and construction permit application.</p>
Compliant if Conditions	<p>Services and Infrastructure: Making available public services and facilities to accommodate the proposed use:</p>

of Approval are Met	Staff Comment: See FOF 26 Availability and Impact on Public Services.
✓	<p>Phasing: The applicant did not request any phasing with the project application. However, due to the scale of the project staff anticipates that the applicant may want to consider phasing of the infrastructure construction at a later date. If the applicant would like to consider phasing of the infrastructure construction a phasing plan would be required to be submitted to the City of Renton for review and approval as a part of the first site plan review application.</p> <p>Pursuant to RMC 4-9-200L. <i>Expiration and Extensions of Site Plan Review</i>, for non-phased Master Plans the Hearing Examiner shall determine the expiration date for the Master Plan which may exceed two years but shall not exceed five years. Staff recommends 5 years from the date of the decision for the period of validity of the subject master plan. However, it should be noted that all lot specific site plan review applications shall be submitted and approved as well as a building permit for each of the subsequent buildings within the 5 year time frame for the project to remain valid.</p>

27. **Binding Site Plan:** An optional process for the division of land classified for industrial, commercial, or mixed use zones CN, CV, CA, CD, CO, COR, UC, IL, IM, and IH through a binding site plan as authorized in chapters 58.17 and 64.34 RCW. This method may be employed as an alternative to the subdivision and short subdivision procedures. The applicant has applied for a Standard Binding Site Plan per RMC 4-7-230B.1.a. and is located in the COR zone a mixed use zone. The proposal is compliant with the binding site plan standards if all conditions of approval are met

Compliance	Subdivision Regulations and Analysis
✓	<p>Legal Lots: The site that is subject to the binding site plan shall consist of one or more contiguous, legally created lots. Lots, parcels, or tracts created through the binding site plan procedure shall be legal lots of record. The number of lots, tracts, parcels, sites, or divisions shall not exceed the number of lots allowed in the applicable zoning district. New nonconforming lots shall not be created through the binding site plan process.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>The subject parcel is a legally created lot of record and all proposed lots would comply with the minimum lot standards of the zone as show in FOF 23 above. The COR zone has no minimum lot size and dimensional standards. However, proposed lots 1, 6, and 7 would be fully impacted by either wetlands and their buffers, shoreline buffer, or NRD Settlement mitigation as identified through the EIS process with the EPA. As such, lots 1, 6, and 7 should become open space tracts instead of lots because these areas would not be buildable if created.</i></p> <p><i>The portion of the parcel water word of the OHWM of Lake Washington is not identified as a lot or tract on the binding site plan. This area remains a part of the parcel and shall be identified on the final binding site plan as an undevelopable area and placed in a tract unless another mechanism is approved by the Property Services Division.</i></p>
✓	<p>Commercial or Industrial Property: The site is located within a commercial, industrial, or mixed-use zone.</p> <p>Staff Comment: <i>The site is located in the COR zone.</i></p>
✓	<p>Zoning Code Requirements: Individual lots created through the binding site plan shall comply with all of the zoning code requirements and development standards of the underlying zoning district.</p>

	<i>Staff Comment: See comments above, Legal Lots, FOF 27.</i>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Shared Components: Under either new construction or existing development, applicants for binding site plan may proposed shared signage, parking, and access if they are specifically authorized per RMC 4-4-080E3, 4-4-080I7, and 4-4-100E5, and other shared improvements as authorized in other sections of the City's development standards.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The applicant has not requested shared signage or parking, however shared access has been proposed.</i></p> <p>Shared parking is required pursuant to Mitigation Measure H7. A proposal for shared parking shall be submitted with site plan review application. If shared parking is proposed between lots and approved by the City at site plan review, this should be noted on the binding site plan prior to recording.</p> <p>Shared access has been proposed through an internal street system, identified as Roads A – E. The applicant has indicated that Roads A – C would be dedicated public right-of-way and Roads D and E would be private streets. However, due to the properties designation as a Superfund Site by the EPA the City is not willing to accept the proposed public rights-of-way dedications and Roads A – C shall become private on the recorded binding site plan. Because Roads A – C will be private streets it is necessary to maintain public access to the development, therefore an easement for public access and emergency services shall be recorded over Roads A, C, and B. The public access easement shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and Property Services Division prior to binding site plan recording.</p> <p>A shared signage package was not submitted with the application.</p>
Not yet determined	<p>Building Code Requirements: All building code requirements have been met per RMC 4-5-010.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Building code compliance will be reviewed at the time of building permit submittal.</i></p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Infrastructure Provisions: Adequate provisions, either on the face of the binding site plan or in a supporting document, have been made for drainageways, alleys, streets, other public ways, water supplies, open space, solid waste, and sanitary wastes, for the entire property covered by the binding site plan.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: Upon Binding Site Plan recording details shall be included identifying compliance with the infrastructure provisions. This shall be reviewed by the Plan Review project manager, Current Planning project manager, and Property Services for approval prior to recording.</i></p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Access to Public Rights-of-Way and Utilities: Each parcel created by the binding site plan shall have access to a public street, water supply, sanitary sewer, and utilities by means of direct access or access easement approved by the City</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See comments above under "Shared Components" to address lot access. Each lot would be served by water, sanitary sewer, and utilities as proposed. However, a phasing plan for the installation of the access and utilities was not provided with the application, therefore staff recommends as a condition of approval that all common facilities including but not limited to roadways, utilities, common landscaping, and public art/gateway features shall be permitted, constructed, and determined substantially complete by the City of Renton Construction Inspector prior to Binding Site Plan Recording and prior to issuance of a building permit for any individual lot, unless a</i></p>

	<i>separate phasing plan is approved through site plan review.</i>
✓	<p>Shared Conditions: The Administrator may authorize sharing of open space, parking, access, signage and other improvements among contiguous properties subject to the binding site plan and the provisions of RMC 4-4-080E3, 4-4-080I7, and 4-4-100E5. Conditions of use, maintenance, and restrictions on redevelopment of shared open space, parking, access, signage and other improvements shall be identified on the binding site plan and enforced by covenants, easements or other similar properly recorded mechanism.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: See discussion above under "Shared Components"</i></p>
✓	<p>Future Development: The binding site plan shall contain a provision requiring that any subsequent development of the site shall be in conformance with the approved and recorded binding site plan.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: The provided binding site plan does not contain a provision for requiring subsequent development of the site to be in conformance with the approved and recorded binding site plan. As such, staff recommends compliance with this standard as a condition of approval.</i></p>
N/A	<p>Dedication Statement: Where lands are required or proposed for dedication, the applicant shall provide a dedication statement and acknowledgement on the binding site plan</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: No dedication has been approved for the subject project.</i></p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS:</p> <p>1. Improvements: The following tangible improvements shall be provided for, either by actual construction or a construction schedule approved by the City and bonded by the applicant, before a binding site plan may be recorded: grading and paving of streets and alleys, installation of curbs, gutters, sidewalks, monuments, sanitary and storm sewers, street lights, water mains and street name signs, together with all appurtenances thereto to specifications and standards of this Code, approved by the Department and in accordance with other standards of the City. A separate construction permit will be required for any such improvements, along with associated engineering plans prepared per the City Drafting Standards.</p> <p>2. Phasing of Improvements: To satisfy these requirements, the Administrator is authorized to impose conditions and limitations on the binding site plan. If the Administrator determines that any delay in satisfying requirements will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare, the Administrator may allow requirements to be satisfied prior to issuing the first building permit for the site, or prior to issuing the first building permit for any phase, or prior to issuing a specific building's certificate of occupancy, or in accordance with an approved phasing plan, or in accordance with plans established by a development agreement or as otherwise permitted or required under City Code.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment: A Phasing plan was not included with the application. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that all common facilities including but not limited to roadways (including curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street trees or landscape strip), utilities, street lights, street names, common landscaping, trails, and public art/gateway features shall be permitted, constructed, and determined substantially complete by the City of Renton Construction Inspector prior to Binding Site Plan Recording and prior to issuance of a building permit for any individual lot, unless a separate phasing plan is approved through site plan review and if the Administrator</i></p>

	<p><i>determines that any delay in satisfying requirements will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.</i></p> <p><i>Off-site improvements identified in the Mitigation Document, include but not limited to the following mitigation measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>B10 - public trail</i> • <i>G2 – public trail and open space</i> • <i>G3 – Frontage improvements, including sidewalks along the west side of Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane N.</i> • <i>G7 – trail signage</i> • <i>G9 – crosswalk</i> • <i>G10 – trail amenities</i> • <i>H3 – frontage improvements along Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane N</i> • <i>H4 – trail</i> • <i>H5 – traffic calming measures</i> • <i>H8 – fire access road</i> • <i>H10 – bicycle lane</i> • <i>H11 – H15 – off site traffic improvement mitigation, such as channelization and signalization</i> <p><i>All the above mitigation measures shall be designed, permitted, constructed, and substantial complete prior to Temporary Occupancy of the first building on the project site. The above mitigation measures are necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare and to mitigate the substantial impacts of the project.</i></p>
--	--

28. Availability and Impact on Public Services

Compliance	Availability and Impact on Public Services Analysis
✓	<p>Police and Fire: Police and Fire Prevention staff indicated that sufficient resources exist to furnish services to the proposed development; if the applicant provides Code required improvements and fees. A Fire Impact Fee would be applicable to the proposal.</p> <p>Pursuant to mitigation measure H8 of the Mitigation Document, A fire access road shall be provided to the west of the westernmost buildings onsite. The road shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide, and shall be constructed with crushed rock or grass-crete to support the weight of fire apparatus, and shall be available for emergency vehicle access. If located in the minimum 100-foot shoreline setback area, and approved by the EPA ROD and any NRD settlement, the road shall also serve as a pedestrian trail. If EPA's ROD or any NRD settlement prohibit the fire access road within the minimum 100-foot shoreline setback area, the road shall be relocated to the west side of the westernmost buildings onsite, and could be combined with the trail.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure H8, allows for the fire access road to be located within the 100 foot shoreline setback area and serve as a combined public trail. However, the looped water line required for the buildings to meet fire flow requirements is only permitted in a paved surface, see comments below under Water. Considering the water service</p>

	requires paved access staff recommends that the water maintenance road and the fire access be combined, this would allow the trail which is to be located in the riparian area to be constructed of soft surface materials, see additional comments below under FOF 29 Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.
✓	<p>Schools: It is anticipated that the Renton School District can accommodate any additional students generated by this proposal at the following schools: Hazelwood Elementary School, McKnight Middle School (beginning in 2017, Risdon Middle School) and Hazen High School. Any new students from the proposed development would be bussed to their schools. Because of the large scope and scale of the subject project it is anticipated that a new bus stop may be added that would pick up students within the Quendall Terminals Development. Specifics to safe walking routes to schools should be evaluated upon lot specific site plan review.</p> <p>A School Impact Fee, based on new multi-family units, will be required in order to mitigate the proposal's potential impacts to the Renton School District. The fee is payable to the City as specified by the Renton Municipal Code.</p>
Not compliant	<p>Parks: A Park Impact Fee would be required for the proposed multi-family units. The fee in effect at the time of building permit application is applicable to this project and is payable at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Impacts to parks and recreation were evaluated in the EIS, Exhibit 2. The mitigation document identified a number of parks and recreation mitigation measures (G1 –G13) to improve public open spaces and recreation areas. Specifically mitigation measure G2 requires that approximately 10.6 acres of "Natural Public Open Space Areas" and "Other Related Areas" be provided on the site. The Natural Public Open Space Area shall include a 0.5 acre trail and 3.2 acres of natural area along the trail. The Other Related Areas on site shall include street level landscaping, landscape courtyards, sidewalks, paved plazas and Lot 7. The provided Site Plan, Exhibit 7, identifies 3.22 acres of Natural Areas along the Shoreline and 0.45 acres of trail, and 6.47 acres in "Other Related Areas". Based on the provided site plan the Preferred Alternative does not identify compliance with Mitigation Measure G2. Mitigation Measure G7, requires the hours of public use of the trail to be determined by the City's Community Services Administrator. Currently public trail hours are dawn to dusk, signage shall be installed identifying that the trail is for public use and the hours of public use. The signage shall be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager and Parks Planning and Natural Resources Director prior to insulation. An easement for public access shall be recorded on with the binding site plan. Mitigation measure G10 requires that the trail shall be enhanced with site amenities such as tables, litter receptacles, benches, interpretive signage etc. and approved by the Community Services Administrator. Details of the trail's design and site amenities was not included in the application materials. Mitigation measure G11 requires that the trail connect to the Barbee Mill residential development to the south. The provided site plan shows the trail ending in the surface parking lot located in the southwest corner of Lot 5. This design is not in compliance with mitigation measure G11. Based on the above analysis the provided materials were not compliant with mitigation measures G2, G7, G10, and G11. As such staff recommends as a condition of approval that the applicant provide an updated site plan and any other necessary materials to identify compliance with mitigation measures G2, G7, G10, and G11 for review and approval of the Current Planning Project Manager and the Community Services Administrator prior to lot</p>

	<i>specific site plan review or binding site plan recording.</i>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Storm Water: An adequate drainage system shall be provided for the proper drainage of all surface water.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> The preferred alternative is assumed to use the 2009 King County Surface Water Design Manual, with the City Amendments, for the proposed stormwater facilities. Stormwater was evaluated in the DEIS and EIS Addendum in the following elements: Earth, Critical Areas, Environmental Heath, and Land and Shoreline Use (Exhibit 2). As a result of this analysis mitigation measures A1, A10, A11, B2, and B7 were established and will become a condition of this permit. Because the internal streets of the development are required to be private, the storm water system for the development will be required to be private. A stormwater covenant for allowing the City access to inspect the stormwater facility and assigning maintenance responsibility of the BMPs to the property owners will required to be recorded with the binding site plan. To ensure that all facilities including but not limited to stormwater shall be maintained staff recommends as a condition of approval that that the applicant provided a covenant or HOA documents for City review and approval identifying the developer/ property owners/ HOA responsibilities for the maintenance of all common facilities and open space constructed as a part of the Binding Site Plan and Master Site Plan.</p> <p>A drainage plan and drainage report (TIR) (based on the City of Renton Amendments to the 2009 King County Surface Water Manual) is required to be submitted with the utility construction permit. The site is located in the Flow Control Duration Standard forested site conditions. The applicant is proposing to use the direct discharge exemption for the project. Water quality treatment is proposed for the project and should follow the requirements of the City of Renton Amendments to the 2009 King County Surface Water Manual. Storm water flow control BMPs are to be provided. All recommendations of the geotechnical report shall be followed in the design and construction of the project. The project was reviewed by the City's Surface Water Utility Supervisor, whom has provided project specific comments in Exhibit 16, in his memo dated September 14, 2009. As noted in Exhibit 16, the updated TIR required to be submitted with the construction permit should include, an offsite analysis report that assesses potential offsite drainage and water quality impacts associated with development of the project site and proposed appropriate mitigation for any of the identified off site impacts, KCRTS printout of all land use input values for pre- and post-developed impervious and pervious areas, a basin summary table for the existing conditions and developed condition land use, and include a wetland analysis for hydrology.</p> <p>As noted above under FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review, subsection Phasing, staff recommends an approval of the subject master site plan and associated binding site plan for 5 years. The Hearing Examiner has discretion to determine the project expiration time frame, which cannot exceed 5 years. Staff is recommending the 5 year maximum expiration date understanding the scale of the subject project and the necessary clean-up of the site under the Superfund designation. However, the City is also subject to the Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater permit. Per the requirements of the Phase II permit; all projects that have been approved prior to January 1, 2017 and have not started construction by January 1, 2022 shall follow the new Surface Water Drainage Manual. Assuming an approval of the subject project no later than May of 2016 the recommended 5 year approval would result in an expiration date of May 2021. If the applicant requests a one-year extension or submits building</p>

	<i>permits the expired land use permit could be extended beyond January 1, 2022 for construction. Based on the City's obligations under Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater permit, staff recommends as a condition of approval that any extension to the project approval beyond January 1, 2022 or building and construction permits submitted that would extend the project beyond January 1, 2022 shall be subject to the updated stormwater manual, in effect at the time of extension or application.</i>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>All utilities: The information provided in the utility plan, Exhibit 14, is not adequate to confirm if there is compliance with the minimum utility spacing standards. The required horizontal and vertical separation as per City of Renton Standards should be provided between the utility lines. To comply with this standard additional pavement width may be required in some areas; if this is the case roads may need to be modified accordingly.</p> <p>The title report submitted with the application is dated 2009, which is 7 years old and out-of-date. As such, staff is unaware if the easements reflected on the drawings are current. Based on the information provided there are existing easements that cross the property in areas proposed for buildings. Any existing utilities under the proposed building or that will result in a conflict shall be required to be abandoned and removed, and the easements shall be relinquished or amended subject to City approval. An updated title report will be required to be submitted prior to Binding Site Plan recording.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Water: New water lines are proposed to be constructed to provide service to the new Lots and buildings. The water utility main lines for the project will be public water lines. However, these lines will primarily be located in private streets; as such a minimum 15 foot wide easement for utility and maintenance shall be provided to the City of Renton for the public water lines located on site.</p> <p>Based on the provided conceptual utility plan, Exhibit 14, the water line design shall be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate about 870 feet of existing 12-inch water main along the property frontage to be within the new access road referred to as Road A. The existing water line cannot be accessible for repair and maintenance due to the location of the proposed new Road A. Relocate the new 12-inch water main on the west side of the project to be within the paved 20-foot fire access road if located outside the 100 foot buffer. The water main must be located at least 10 feet away from the building foundation and outside of the shoreline riparian area. To comply with these conditions, the buildings will need to be moved back further to the east to allow for the construction of the water main. Complete the water main loop within a paved surface with sufficient access for maintenance along the west side of the project from Street B to Street E. <p>Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the above water line design changes shall be provided and an updated conceptual utility plan shall be provided for review and approval by the Plan Reviewer prior to lot specific site plan application and construction permit application.</p>
Compliant if Conditions	Sanitary Sewer: New sewer lines are proposed to be constructed to provide service to the new Lots and buildings. The sewer utility main lines for the project will be public

of Approval are Met	<p>sewer lines. However, these lines will primarily be located in private streets; as such a minimum 15-foot wide easement shall be provided to the City of Renton for the public sewer main located in the private streets. Each individual building is required to be served by individual side sewers.</p> <p>The provided sewer report states that the sewer system was designed to convey the peak flows by gravity to the project discharge location at a new manhole installed on an existing 12" diameter City of Renton sewer pipe, which would lead to the existing Baxter lift station, a City owned facility. A sewer report was submitted with the application which showed an allowance of 1,100 gallons/acre/day for infiltration and inflow at the existing lift station. Based on review by the City's Waste Water Department, the allowance number should be increased to 1,500 gallons/acre/day. As such staff recommends as a condition of approval that a revised sewer report be submitted with the construction permit application that will reevaluate the existing Baxter lift station and identify the necessary allowance.</p> <p>The current utility plan identifies a sewer man hole located in the center of the island on Street B. The manhole should be relocated outside of this area to ensure the City's sewer maintenance department can access the facility. Utility casing may need to be provided on pipes constructed through the islands.</p>
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Transportation: Access to the site is proposed via the development of new internal Roads A – E. The primary site access from public streets is proposed at two locations one from N 42nd Place and a second from Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way). See additional comments related to roads and access above under FOF 24, Design Review: 2. Parking and Vehicular Access, subsection c. Vehicular Access and FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review: g. Access.</p> <p>Transportation impacts were extensively evaluated in the DEIS, EIS Addendum and in the FEIS, Exhibit 2. As a result mitigation measures H1 – H15 are a requirement of the project, and are conditions to be completed prior to temporary occupancy of any building on the site. Mitigation Measure H3 requires frontage improvements along the west side of Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) in front of the site. Other mitigation includes, but is not limited to, travel lane additions, signalization, and additional turn lanes on adjacent and nearby existing roadways or areas to be dedicated. Per mitigation measures G3 and H3, provisions for safe pedestrian circulation shall encourage future transit usage to and from the site, which shall include the requirement for a cross walk and frontage improvements along two private access roads that will cross the old rail line, currently owned by King Co. The private access at the Barbee Mill Access shall include frontage improvements including landscaped planter and sidewalk to be provided on the north side matching the existing landscaped planter and sidewalk on the south side. The new private access to be located at the Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) access shall include an 8-foot wide landscape planter and 6-foot wide sidewalk on south side of the access.</p> <p>The construction of off street improvements will require coordination with adjacent property owners as some of the required improvements will impact property outside of existing right-of-way and require dedication of property not currently owned by the applicant. Currently it is anticipated this coordination would be between King County, who owns the old rail-road right-of-way, the property owner of 4350 Lake Washington Blvd. N, and WSDOT. Do to the necessary coordination with adjacent property owners and WSDOT staff recommends as a condition of approval that before construction permit and building permit issuance an agreement should be completed for the</p>

required off-site improvements between the developer and all other affected properties. Such agreement shall be provided to the Current Planning Project Manager with the construction permit application and the first building permit application for the site.

The numerous traffic mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Document could cause some confusion as it relates to the directions of the off-site improvements, such as southbound, westbound, and eastbound, because the intersections are not oriented directly north, east, south, and west. To assist in the understanding of these mitigation measures Figure 2-1 was prepared for the FEIS, Exhibit 2. However, upon further review of the mitigation measures in the final Mitigation Document, the City's Transportation Department, has indicated that all required improvements are not reflected in Figure 2-1. In addition the mitigation measures listed in the final Mitigation Document contains some inconsistencies as it relates to directions (northbound and eastbound) and requirements evaluated in the analysis of the DEIS, EIS Addendum, and FEIS. To resolve the inconsistencies between the mitigation measures, Figure 2-1 and the traffic analysis, a new graphic has been created and is attached as Exhibit 18 which fully depicts additional motor vehicular travel lanes required as a part of the FEIS and the Mitigation Document. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that all new lanes as shown on Exhibit 18 shall be constructed.

In addition the mitigation measures, internal review has been completed evaluating the internal road cross sections. Plan Review staff has worked with the City's Transportation Division to evaluate the adequacy of the internal street cross sections, for pedestrian walkways, travel lanes, on street parking, and landscaping standards. This evaluation coupled with the Design District Standards and Development Standards of the zone has resulted in recommended changes to the proposed cross sections. These roads will become private roads for the purpose of the project as such strict adherence to the City's standard street cross sections is not required, however the design of the streets shall meet minimum standards to accommodate the demand created by the development. Public access will be required for access to the proposed retail and restaurant uses; in addition to meet the standards of public access under the shoreline master program (see FOF 29), as such staff recommends as a condition of approval that a public access easement shall be recorded over the private roadways and recorded at the same time of Binding Site Plan Recording. See Exhibit 16 for details on street cross section changes required to meet the anticipated needs of the development for pedestrians, vehicles, public access, Design District Standards, and landscaping. As noted above under FOF 24 Design Standards, the street cross section design will vary depending upon the proposed ground floor design of each building. In general, 10 feet of landscaping is required behind a 6 foot sidewalk in those areas where a parking structure is located adjacent to the street, or a 12 – 15 foot sidewalk is required for those areas where the building contains retail and/or restaurant uses at the ground floor. On street parking stall widths are reduced per RMC from 10 feet in places to 8 or 6 feet in width, travel lanes are reduced from 12 feet to 10 feet in places, a 0.5 foot is added to account for the curb width, and the required site landscape setbacks are reflected in the cross section amendments. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the applicant amended the street cross section as shown in Exhibit 16 at the time of construction permit review; in addition an updated site plan shall be submitted identifying compliance with the amended cross sections.

Road A is currently designed with a center turn lane; the need for this turn lane was not analyzed in the EIS documents or in a separate transportation study submitted with the

	<p>application. Therefore, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a study is completed to identify the need for a center turn lane in Road A. Depending upon the outcome of this study, Road A street designs shall be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative is anticipated to generate 5,656 net new average weekday daily trips. During the weekday AM peak hour, the project would generate approximately 435 net new trips (104 inbound and 331 outbound). During the weekday PM peak hour, the project would generate approximately 530 net new trips (340 inbound and 190 outbound). The proposed project passes the City of Renton Traffic Concurrency Test per RMC 4-6-070.D as shown in Exhibit 17.</p> <p>See additional comments related to pedestrian connectivity and bicycle access above under, FOF 26, Master Site Plan Review, subsection g. Access.</p>
--	---

29. **Shoreline Substantial Development Permit:** No shoreline development shall be undertaken on shoreline of the City without first obtaining a substantial development permit. No permit shall be issued unless the proposal is consistent with the Shoreline Master Program (SMP, and the Shoreline Management Act of 1971). The site is located in the Urban Environment of the SMP and is consistent with the Shoreline Master Program and the Shoreline Management Act as demonstrated in the table below if all conditions of approval are met.

Compliance	Shoreline Permit Analysis
Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met	<p>Use Regulations:</p> <p>a. <u>Commercial:</u> New commercial development on Lake Washington which are neither water-dependent, nor water related, nor water-enjoyment, nor which do not provide significant public access to and along the water's edge will not be permitted upon the shoreline.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> The proposed commercial development is not water-dependent, nor water related, nor water enjoyment. However, a public trail is provided along the shoreline to provide public access along the water's edge, if approved by the EPA ROD and any NRD settlement. Conditions of approval have been recommend throughout this staff report for designated public parking for trail use, amenities to be incorporated into the trail including view points, large public plaza spaces along the lake side of Road B, and a public promenade along the lake side of the new buildings proposed on Lots 2 and 5. If all these conditions of approval are met significant public access along the water's edge would be provided and therefore the new commercial development would be considered a permitted use. However, if the public amenities are prohibited by the EPA ROD and any NRD settlement the subject use would not be permitted, because significant public access is not provided. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that if the EPA ROD and any NRD settlement eliminates the significant public access from the project a new project design shall be submitted for review and approval prior to construction permit, site plan application, and binding site plan recording that complies with the shoreline master programs requirements for significant public access.</p> <p>b. <u>Parking:</u> Public parking is to be provided at frequent locations. Both public and private parking is discouraged along the water's edge.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> Surface parking and structured parking are both proposed approximately 100 feet back form the OHWM. These parking lots are not located along the water's edge.</p>

<p>Compliant if Conditions of Approval are Met</p>	<p>Incorporation of Public Recreational Opportunities: Commercial developments should incorporate recreational opportunities along the shoreline for the general public. Multi-family development shall provide public access along the water's edge, in the Case of Lake Washington, significance public access shall be provided.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> Staff has reviewed the proposed public access which includes a trail within the shoreline riparian area. The Mitigation Document requires this trail included view points and amenities. The proposed trail begins to meet the standard of significant public access. The trail is the only amenity provided in the Preferred Alternative which on its own does not pass the test of significant public access. There are a number of opportunities for additional public access to be incorporated into the project design, some of which have been identified throughout this staff report, including a public plaza at the terminus of road B. This plaza space would provide visual access to the lake and could include amenities such as benches, terraced setting, public art, or gateway features. Furthermore, as noted above under FOF 28 Availability of Public Services, the looped water main required around buildings proposed on Lot 2 and 5 is required to have an access roadway and be located out of the shoreline riparian area. The waterline requirement combined with the fire access requirements presents an opportunity to combine both the water line, fire access and design the space in a way that it could be used as public access to the shoreline. This space, if designed with amenities such as public art, seating, water features, etc. would create a public promenade with visual access to the shoreline. The addition of a public promenade along the lake side of both Lots 2 and 5 would add significant public access to the project. As such, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a public promenade is added along the lake side of the buildings on Lot 2 and 5. This promenade should connect to the terminus of Road B and the surface parking lots at the north and south ends of the site.</p> <p>See comments above under "Use Regulation.</p>
<p>✓</p>	<p>View Impacts: The applicant for a shoreline development permit for a new commercial development must indicate in his application the effect which the proposed commercial development will have upon the scenic view prevailing in the given area. Specifically, the applicant must state in his permit what steps have been take in the design of the proposed commercial development to reduce to a minimum interference with the scenic view enjoyed by any significant number of people the area.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 26 Master Site Plan Review: e. Off Site Impacts, Views.</p>
<p>Compliant if conditions of approval are met</p>	<p>Setback: A commercial building should be located no closer than 50 feet to the ordinary high water mark.</p> <p><u>Staff Comment:</u> See FOF 24 Zoning Development Standard Compliance: Setbacks.</p> <p>The provided conceptual utility plan, identifies the required looped water line in the shoreline riparian area (100 foot buffer). Pursuant to the EIS and Mitigation Document a 100 foot shoreline buffer was required from the OHWM of Lake Washington. This area is assumed in the baseline conditions to be utilized for habitat restoration and wetland mitigation and buffers. The waterline shall not be constructed within the riparian area and shall be located outside the buffers. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the waterline shall be relocated outside the 100 buffer and an updated conceptual utility plan shall be provided identifying compliance with this standard.</p>

✓	<p>Time Requirements for Shoreline Permits: RMC 4-9-190J permits extension of the standard SSDP time lines identified in RMC 4-9-190J.2. if consistent with RCW 90.58.143 and the Hearing Examiner, upon a finding of good cause and with the approval of the Department of Ecology, established appropriate time limits as part of a SSDP. SSDP are valid for 2 years with the potential to authorize construction up to 5 years after the effective date of the SSDP, if construction application are submitted, permits are issued and foundation inspection are completed.</p> <p><i>Staff Comment:</i> Given the project cannot move to construction until the EPA issues a ROD and a NRD Settlement is determined, two years may not be sufficient to complete the project and obtain all necessary permits. Therefore, staff recommends that the SSDP expiration date be consistent with the Master Plan expiration date. Staff recommends that there shall be no extensions authorized to the SSDP beyond the 5 years, unless the project complies with the updated Shoreline Master Program, adopted in 2011.</p>
---	---

I. CONCLUSIONS:

1. The subject site is located in the Commercial/Office/Residential (COR) Comprehensive Plan designation and complies with the goals and policies established with this designation provided the applicant complies with all conditions of approval, see FOF 22.
2. The subject site is located in the Commercial/Office/Residential (COR) zoning designation and complies with the zoning and development standards established with this designation provided the applicant complies with City Code and conditions of approval, see FOF 23.
3. The proposed development complies with the Design District C Standards provided the applicant complies with City Code and conditions of approval, see FOF 24.
4. The proposed development complies with the Critical Areas Regulations provided the applicant complies with City Code and conditions of approval, see FOF 25.
5. The proposed development complies with the Master Site Plan Review Criteria provided the applicant complies with City Code and conditions of approval, see FOF 26.
6. The proposed Binding Site Plan complies with the subdivision regulations as established by City Code and state law provided all City Code, advisory notes and conditions are complied with, see FOF 27.
7. Safe walking routes to the school bus stop will be evaluated at lot specific site plan review. The Renton School District has indicated they can accommodate the anticipated number of students, see FOF 28.
8. There are adequate public services and facilities to accommodate the proposed development in all City Codes and conditions of approval are complied with, see FOF 28.
9. The proposed development complies with the Shoreline Master Program and the Shoreline Management Act standards, see FOF 29.
10. An expiration date shall be set by the Hearing Examiner for the Master Site Plan, see FOF 26.
11. Key features, which are integral to this project include a 100 foot shoreline setback, public trail, building height modulation, setbacks from the north and south property lines, and view corridors.

J. RECOMMENDATION:

Master Site Plan and Binding Site Plan:

Staff recommends approval of the Quendall Terminals Preferred Alternative (692 Residential Units, 9,000 SF of restaurant, and 20,025 SF of retail) Master Plan and Binding Site Plan, File No. LUA09-151, with an expiration date 5 years for approval, as depicted in Exhibit 7, subject to the following conditions:

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit:

Staff recommends approval of the Quendall Terminals Preferred Alternative (692 Residential Units, 9,000 SF of restaurant, and 20,025 SF of retail) Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, File No. LUA09-151, with an expiration date of 5 years with no extensions authorized to the permit beyond the 5 years, unless the project complies with the updated Shoreline Master Program, adopted in 2011, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with the 91 mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Document dated, August of 2015.
2. All lots shall meet maximum building lot coverage either individually or combined through site plan review. The combined coverage may include open space tracts set aside through the binding site plan.
3. All common facilities including but not limited to roadways (including curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street trees or landscape strips), utilities, street lights, street names, common landscaping (including irrigation), trails (including signage and amenities), public art/gateway features, and habitat restoration/recreation as determined by the EPA ROD shall be permitted, constructed, and determined substantially complete by the City of Renton Construction Inspector and Current Planning Project Manager prior to Binding Site Plan Recording and prior to issuance of a building permit for any individual lot, unless a separate phasing plan is approved and if the Administrator determines that any delay in satisfying these requirements will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
4. The minimum partial sight-obscurating landscape visual barrier (buffers) shall be maintained along the north and south property line as shown in Exhibit 11 and shall be identified on the recorded binding site plan, as required by Mitigation Measures E1, E2, and F5.
5. A minimum of 10 feet of screening landscaping shall be required behind the sidewalk when the sidewalk is adjacent to at grade parking structures. A detailed landscape plan for each site shall be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review.
6. Lots 1, 6, and 7 shall become open space tracts and shall not be recorded as lots on the Binding Site Plan. All critical areas and their buffer shall be contained within these tracts as referenced and required by Mitigation Measure B5. A Native Growth Protection Easement shall be recorded and noted on the face of the recorded Binding Site Plan.
7. If shared parking is proposed between lots and is approved by the City at site plan review, this should be noted on the binding site plan prior to recording.
8. Roads A – C shall become private streets on the recorded binding site plan and an easement for public access and emergency services shall be recorded over Roads A, C, and B. The public access easement shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and Property Services Division prior to binding site plan recording.
9. The recorded binding site plan shall contain a provision requiring that any subsequent development of the site shall be in conformance with the approved and recorded binding site plan. The required statement should be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager and Property Services prior to recording.
10. Public trail signage shall be installed identifying that the trail is for public use and the hours of public use. The trail signage shall be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Community Services Administrator with the construction permit application. The trail and associated signage shall be installed prior to Temporary Occupancy of the first building on the project site.

11. An easement for public trail access shall be recorded with the binding site and public access shall be noted on the binding site plan prior to recording.
12. Off-site improvements identified in the Mitigation Document, including but not limited to Mitigation Measures:
 - B10 - public trail
 - G2 – public trail and open space
 - G3 – Frontage improvements, including sidewalks along the west side of Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane N.
 - G7 – trail signage
 - G9 – crosswalk
 - G10 – trail amenities
 - H3 – frontage improvements along Lake Washington Blvd. and Ripley Lane N
 - H4 – trail
 - H5 – traffic calming measures
 - H8 – fire access road
 - H10 – bicycle lane
 - H11 – H15 – off site traffic improvement mitigation, such as channelization and signalizationshall be designed, permitted, constructed, and substantial complete as determined by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Construction Inspector, prior to Temporary Occupancy of the first building on the project site.
13. The following street classification shall be noted on the binding site plan: Road A, B, and C are Pedestrian Oriented Streets, and Roads D and E are Internal Roads.
14. The private access at the Barbee Mill Access shall include frontage improvements matching the south side of the access, including a landscaped planter and sidewalk to be provided on the east north side. The new private access to be located at the Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) access shall include 8 feet wide landscape planter and 6 foot wide sidewalk on south side of the access. These off-site improvements shall be designed, permitted, constructed, and substantial complete as determined by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Construction Inspector, prior to Temporary Occupancy of the first building on the project site
15. Either commercial uses are provided along the street frontages of roads A, B, and C or a minimum 10 foot landscape screen is located between the sidewalk and the parking garage. Compliance with this condition shall be demonstrated at lot specific site plan review.
16. Parking garage curb cuts shall be reduced to the minimum necessary to improve uninterrupted pedestrian mobility along Road A and C and curb cuts should not be permitted along Road B. Access points to the parking decks shall be consolidated with the ground level parking garages. Compliance with this condition shall be demonstrated at lot specific site plan review.
17. Vehicular access points to the parking garages shall be restricted to one entrance and exit per 500 linear feet as measured horizontally along the street, unless a secondary access is required per fire and/or building code. Compliance with this condition shall be demonstrated at lot specific site plan review.
18. To ensure the semi-private plaza spaces meet the intent of the design district a detailed design of these areas shall be submitted for review and approval with lot specific site plan review. Each plaza area shall provide a unique space that includes both landscaping and amenities as approved by the Director.

19. To ensure that all uses receive equal signage opportunities an overall sign design package shall be submitted for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to the approval of any sign permit for the site.
20. Minimum setbacks from parent parcels edges shall be as follows:
 - a. 100 feet from the OHWM of Lake Washington
 - b. 40 feet from the south (adjacent to Barbee Mill)
 - c. 38 feet from the north (adjacent to Seahawk's Training Facility)
21. To ensure minimum view corridors are maintained Road B shall maintain a minimum width of 74 feet and the semi-private plaza spaces on top of the parking garages shall maintain a minimum width of 80 feet.
22. East elevations of the building proposed on Lots 2 and 5 shall be re-designed to reduce to the parking garage walls view from Lake Washington to ensure the structures on the lake maintain a relation to the natural characteristic and site amenities (trail, etc.). Design features could include landscape berming and/or architectural details. Detail design of these buildings shall be completed at site plan review.
23. Secure, weather protected bike parking facilities shall be provided for the residential units on site. Bike parking should be provided at a ratio of 0.5 stalls per unit. Bike parking for the residents shall not be located on balconies or in the unit. A residential bike parking plan shall be provided with lot specific site plan review.
24. A compatible architectural design shall be maintained throughout the Quendall Terminals site and a consistence evaluation shall be completed at site plan review for each building proposed on lots 2, 3, 4, and 5.
25. Usable public plaza space shall be provided along Lake Washington and the NW corner of the building on Lot 5 and the SW corner of the building on Lot 2. The details of the design of this space shall be included in the lot specific site plan review applications for lots 2 and 5.
26. Details shall be included on the final Binding Site Plan identifying compliance with the infrastructure provisions of RMC 4-7-230. This shall be reviewed by the Plan Review project manager, Current Planning project manager, and Property Services for approval prior to recording.
27. If the ROD and NRD Settlement results in the project's inability to comply with the critical area regulations as currently designed and assumed in the baseline conditions (i.e. the buffers of the recreated wetlands can be averaged within proposed lots 1 and 6) Lots 1 and 6 shall be increased to ensure compliance with the critical areas regulations and that all wetlands and associated buffers are contained in what will become NGPA tracts. If the change to the overall development is considered a Major Adjustment to an approved site development plan per RMC 4-9-200J a new application would be required.
28. A bicycle lane shall be constructed on both the north and south side of Ripley Lane (Seahawks Way) with or without the construction of the multi-purpose trail.
29. The applicant shall amend the street cross section as shown in Exhibit 16 at the time of construction permit review.
30. A stormwater covenant for allowing the City access to inspect the stormwater facilities built on site and assigning maintenance responsibility of the BMPs to the property owners/developer/HOA shall be required to be recorded with the binding site plan.
31. To ensure that all facilities including but not limited to, stormwater, common landscaping, open space, sidewalks and roadways, street lights, open space tracts, etc. shall be maintained, the applicant shall

provide a covenant or HOA documents for City review and approval identifying the developer/property owners/HOA responsibilities for the maintenance of all common facilities constructed as a part of the Binding Site Plan and Master Site Plan. Approved documentation shall be recorded with the Binding Site Plan.

32. Any extension to the project approved beyond January 1, 2022 or building and construction permits submitted that would extend the project beyond January 1, 2022 shall be subject to the updated stormwater manual, in effect at the time.
33. A minimum 15 foot wide easement shall be provided to the City of Renton for the public sewer mains located in the private streets. The easement shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Renton Property Services and Public Works Department prior to binding site plan recording.
34. A minimum 15 foot wide easement for utility and maintenance shall be provided to the City of Renton for the public water lines located onsite. The easement shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Renton Property Services and Public Works Department prior to binding site plan recording.
35. The Binding Site Plan shall be recorded prior to temporary occupancy of any building on the subject site.
36. A revised sewer report shall be submitted with the construction permit application that will reevaluate the existing Baxter lift station and identify the necessary allowance, which should be 1,500 gallons/acre/day, or as otherwise identified by the City Public Works Department.
37. Any existing utilities under the proposed building or that will result in a conflict with the proposed binding site plan, shall be required to be abandoned and removed, and the easement shall be relinquished or amended subject to City approval. Final documentation shall be submitted for review and approval prior to Binding Site Plan recording.
38. The proposed sewer manhole should be relocated outside of the landscape island in the center of Road B to ensure the City's sewer maintenance department can access the facility.
39. Before construction permit and building permit issuance an agreement should be completed for the required off-site improvements between the developer and all other affected properties. Such agreement shall be provided to the Current Planning Project Manager with the construction permit application and the first building permit application for the site.
40. All new motor vehicle travel lanes as shown on Exhibit 18 shall be constructed based on the timing identified above per condition of approval 12.
41. A public promenade along Lake Washington extending along the front of Lots 2 and 5, connecting to Road B terminus and the surface parking at either end shall be incorporated into the design of the buildings on Lots 2 and 5. This promenade shall feature pedestrian amenities such as furniture, public art, water features, etc. Design of the promenades compliance with this condition shall be reviewed at the time of lot specific site plan review.
42. The portion of the parcel water word of the OHWM of Lake Washington shall be identified on the final binding site plan as an undevelopable area and placed in a tract unless another mechanism is approved by the Property Services Division.
43. An easement shall be secured from King County or other future property owners of the rail-road right-of-way to provided vehicular and pedestrian access to the proposed development across the right-of-way. The easement shall be noted on the final binding site plan and shall be recorded concurrently with the binding site plan.

44. The following conditions shall be complied with prior to individual site plan review application for any lot included in the Binding Site Plan, Binding Site Plan recording, and construction permit issuance.
- I. Upon the EPA, ROD and NRD settlement, a density worksheet shall be submitted to the Current Planning Project Manager identifying compliance with net density for the overall site. Once compliance is identified, the maximum number of units per lot shall be recorded on the final binding site plan to allow the maximum permitted density to be shared among the entire property.
 - II. A final detailed landscape plan and associated irrigation plan shall be submitted for review and approval for the common areas, unless a phasing plan for common landscaping installation is approved. If a phasing plan is submitted and approved, a final detailed landscape plan, or phase thereof, shall be submitted in compliance with the approved phasing plan.
 - III. A parking plan shall be provided specifically identifying public parking for the proposed shoreline trail, in compliance with Mitigation Measure G4, for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Park Planning and Natural Resources Director. The approved public parking shall be identified on the recording Binding Site Plan.
 - IV. A site plan application, construction permit application or the recording of the Binding Site shall not be submitted to the City for Review and approval prior to a Record of Decision (ROD) and NRD Settlement completed by the EPA. A copy of the final ROD and NRD Settlement issued by the EPA shall be submitted to the City of Renton to verify the assumed baseline assumptions were correct and additional SEPA review or major project changes are not necessary as required in Mitigation Measure C10.
 - V. The applicant shall provide an updated site plan and any other necessary materials to identify compliance with mitigation measures G2, G7, G10, and G11 for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Community Services Administrator.
 - VI. A “gateway feature” package shall be prepared for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager. If such gateway features would be considered common amenities such as public art or entry elements these shall be installed pursuant to condition of approval 3.
 - VII. An update site plan shall be provided identifying a complete connected pedestrian pathway system, including an evaluation of on-site crosswalks to ensure pedestrian safety. The pedestrian pathway system shall be submitted for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and shall demonstrate compliance with mitigation measure H3, H4 and H9. The final approved pedestrian pathway system shall be shown on the binding site plan upon recording.
 - VIII. An updated site plan shall be provided identifying the required 1.8 acres of active recreation area, per mitigation measure G8, or a plan shall be provided for review and approval of the Current Planning Project Manager to identify which portion of the 1.8 acres would be allocated to which lot.
 - IX. A site lighting plan shall be provided identifying compliance with mitigation measure F13 and H9 and the design standards for the common areas, including but not limited to, sidewalks, roadways, gateway features, public art, special landscape treatment, open space/plaza, and trails, for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager, Public Works Department, and Community Services.

- X. Documentation shall be provided to the City identifying rights to construct a crossing for vehicles and pedestrians across King County owned rail road right-of-way.
- XI. Bicycle parking shall be provided in the form of bike racks for commercial and public trail users. Bike parking should be provided at a ratio of 10 percent of the required parking stalls for the commercial uses. An updated site plan shall be provided identifying common bike rack locations, numbers, and design.
- XII. A detailed trail design, identifying compliance with mitigation measures B10, G3, G2, G10, G11 and H4, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Community Services Department.
- XIII. An updated site plan shall be submitted for reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager and Plan Reviewer identifying compliance with the amended street cross sections, in Exhibit 16.
- XIV. A transportation study shall be completed to analyze the need for a center turn lane in Road A. Depending upon the outcome of this study, Road A street designs shall be amended accordingly and reflected on the required updated site plan, as conditioned above under XIII.
- XV. The following utility line design changes shall be required and an updated conceptual utility plan shall be provided for review and approval by the Plan Reviewer:
 - a. Relocate about 870 feet of existing 12-inch water main along the property frontage to be within the new access road referred to as Road A. The existing water line cannot be accessible for repair and maintenance due to the location of the proposed new Road A.
 - b. Relocate the new 12-inch water main on the west side of the project to be within the paved 20-foot fire access road if located outside the 100 foot buffer. The water main must be located at least 10 feet away from the building foundation and outside of the shoreline riparian area.
 - c. Minimum 15 feet easement should be provided for the water main.
 - d. The waterline shall be relocated outside the 100 shoreline buffer.
 - e. Update utility line minimum separation standards per City of Renton regulations.
- XVI. If the EPA ROD and any NRD settlement eliminates the significant public access from the project, which includes: 1) A shoreline trail with viewpoints, interpretive signage, and amenities as identified in the Mitigation Document; 2) A public promenade along the lake side of the development of Lots 2 and 5; 3) Large plazas at the terminus of Road B; and 4) Public parking a new public access plan shall be submitted identifying compliance with the significant public access standards of the Shoreline Master Program. The new public access plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager.
- XVII. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program and draft shared parking agreement shall be submitted for any and all proposed development lots, identifying compliance with Mitigation Measures H2, H7 and F12. The TDM and shared parking agreements shall be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager and the Public Works Department, Transportation Division.